

Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, April 13, 1998  
Volume 34—Number 15  
Pages 569–633

## Contents

### Addresses and Remarks

Andrew W. Mellon Dinner—611  
Assault weapons ban—582  
Illinois  
Democratic Business Council dinner in  
Chicago—600  
Rachel Carson School in Chicago—607  
Kentucky  
Carroll County High School in Carrollton—  
619  
Roundtable discussion on tobacco in  
Carrollton—612  
Major League Soccer champion D.C.  
United—583  
Missouri, National Forum on Social Security  
in Kansas City  
Panel discussion—592  
Remarks—585  
Teleconference remarks to regional  
forums—588  
NCAA football champion Michigan  
Wolverines and Nebraska Cornhuskers—  
623  
Northern Ireland peace process—628  
Radio address—574  
Senator Barbara Mikulski, reception  
honoring—626  
Senegal, roundtable discussion with human  
rights activists in Dakar—569

### Communications to Congress

Iraq, letter reporting—576  
Lapse of the Export Administration Act of  
1979, letter transmitting report—585  
Vietnam, letter on most-favored-nation  
status—599

### Communications to Federal Agencies

Korean Peninsula Energy Development  
Organization, memorandum—574

### Executive Orders

American Heritage Rivers Initiative Advisory  
Committee—606  
Waiver Under the Trade Act of 1974 With  
Respect to Vietnam—599

### Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters  
Oval Office—628  
Rose Garden—583

### Letters and Messages

Easter, message—625  
Fair Housing Act, 30th anniversary,  
message—630  
Passover, message—600  
Pilgrimage to Memphis Celebrating the Life  
of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., message—  
575

### Proclamations

Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.—599  
National D.A.R.E. Day—626  
National Former Prisoner of War Recognition  
Day—625  
Pan American Day and Pan American  
Week—631

### Resignations and Retirements

Energy Department, Secretary Federico Peña,  
statement—584  
Interior Department, Deputy Secretary John  
Garamendi, statement—624

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

**Editor's Note:** The Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents is also available on the Internet on the *GPO Access* service at <http://www.gpo.gov/nara/nara003.html>.

## WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

## Contents—Continued

### **Statements by the President**

*See also* Resignations and Retirements  
Breast cancer prevention trial—585  
Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty,  
    British and French ratification—585  
Death of Tammy Wynette—598  
U.S.-France civil aviation agreement—611

### **Supplementary Materials**

Acts approved by the President—633  
Checklist of White House press releases—633  
Digest of other White House  
    announcements—632  
Nominations submitted to the Senate—633

Week Ending Friday, April 10, 1998

**Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion  
With Human Rights Activists in  
Dakar, Senegal**  
*April 2, 1998*

**The President.** First let me say how delighted that I am to have such a distinguished group to discuss human rights and democracy in Africa. I thank our panelists for being here, and also let me thank all of those who are here in the audience who have worked on this cause across the continent in your various countries and, in at least one instance, in your particular village.

I think it is clear that there has been some significant progress in Africa in the decade of the nineties. The number of governments that were elected by their people have gone from 5 to 24. But we have to be clear: There is still a huge human rights challenge, a huge democracy challenge in Africa.

We believe that human rights are universal. That's what the international Declaration of Human Rights says. That's why the United States has worked hard to support democracy and human rights in Africa. Since 1989, we have worked in 46 different African nations. We have invested more than \$400 million of our taxpayers' money to support elections, to reform judiciaries, to strengthen the participation of citizens in decisionmaking that affects our own lives. That support will continue.

I have seen many heartening signs.

And I want to say a special word of appreciation to the First Lady for the work she's done on these issues, especially beginning at the Beijing women's conference and the work that began here in Senegal last year on the issue of female genital mutilation, which I know she had a meeting about this morning.

Would you like to say anything before we begin?

*[Hillary Clinton welcomed the guests and recognized a group of villagers from*

*Malicounda Bambara, praising their efforts to eliminate the ancient custom of female circumcision in Senegal.]*

**The President.** Now, let's begin. There are many issues that I hope we can have discussed today, and they may be covered in the initial comments by our speakers. We want to talk about democracy and human rights. We want to talk about the threat of ethnic conflict to forming a unified democratic environment. We want to talk about the challenge of investigating past abuses and working for justice while promoting national unity and reconciliation, issues of freedom of the press, women's rights. There are a number of things that I hope we can deal with today.

But again, I want all of you to feel free to say mostly what it is you want to say about where you are, what you're doing, and what you believe the United States can do to support your endeavors.

Who would like to go first? Someone volunteer? Archbishop?

*[Archbishop Ndingi Mwana a' Nzeki, of Nairobi, Kenya, chairman, Kenya National Justice and Peace Commission, explained that while Kenya has made advancements in democracy and human rights, corruption among law enforcement and political leaders has led to increased violent crime. He stated that the people of Kenya need U.S. support to continue their struggle for reform.]*

**The President.** Thank you very much.

*[Samuel Kofi Woods, executive director, Justice and Peace Commission, National Catholic Secretariat, described the human rights situation in Liberia and urged the United States to support the establishment of institutions in Liberia that would safeguard the rights of its citizens and advance the cause of democracy. Reginald Matchaba Hove, chairman, Zimbabwe Human Rights Association, discussed the process of reconciliation*

*following human rights abuses, stating that confession, acknowledgement of guilt, and forgiveness were necessary steps in a cathartic exercise helpful to both the abused and the abuser. He encouraged the U.S. Government to support local initiatives to ensure reconciliation and commended the President's visit, particularly to Goree Island, as an important gesture.]*

**The President.** Thank you, Doctor, very much. I don't want to interrupt the flow of the statements, but I would like to pose a question that we can return to perhaps after you all make your statements, if it's not convenient to address it as you go along. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa to which you referred obviously has made a great impression on people all across the world, and it has a great appeal. Yet, thinking about practically how you would do it in another country raises the question of whether it is possible if the leader of the country is not someone like Mr. Mandela. That is, he suffered so grievously himself, he is in a position to come forward and say, "This is the procedure I advocate, and if it's okay with me, who are you to say it's not enough?"

So, on the one hand, since he was the oppressed, he can make sure—to go back to something that Sam and the Archbishop said—he can make sure that the power of government is put at the service of the people who have been abused, something that others may not be able to do. And on the other hand, he can say to those who lost their loved ones or who were horribly scarred or maimed, "I can forgive. You should, too." So there is a unique position there.

If you sought to do something like that in other countries and we wanted to support it, as a practical matter, could it be done in a way that would either make the people who had been abused feel that they were at peace or, on the other hand, reach the consciousness of those who may be duly elected now but still may have done things for which they should atone? That, I think, is the problem we have all tried to come to terms with.

Anyway, who would like to go next? Anyone?

*[Baudoin Hamuli of the Democratic Republic of Congo (formerly Zaire), executive secretary, National Council of Development, Non-Governmental Organizations, described the positive changes that had occurred since President Laurent Kabila replaced former President Mobutu Sese Seko, but expressed concern that without a constitutionally based government, the opportunity still existed for abuse of power by the current President. He urged the United States to pressure President Kabila for more democratization and to support peace efforts in the Great Lakes area, poverty alleviation programs, and economic reconstruction.]*

**The President.** Let me just say very briefly about this, this is very helpful. Any hope we have, I think, of having a regional system for developing the Great Lakes region, and indeed to some extent a larger in Africa, rests on the successful emergence of the Congo as a functioning democratic society. And we have here leaders—Mr. Royce, the Chairman of the Africa Subcommittee in the Congress, and our Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, and Reverend Jackson, my Special Envoy for Africa—we're all trying to figure out how we can best work with and influence Mr. Kabila, because, as you point out, I think one of their biggest handicaps is so many of them in the government were out of the Congo for so long. And then when they came in and started the struggle to replace Mobutu, I think it happened even more easily and more quickly than they thought it would.

But now they're confronted with what has typically been a dilemma, sometimes more imagined than real, for people in positions of governance. They say, "Well, you know, these countries, they fluctuate between anarchy and abusive dictatorship, so I don't want anarchy, so maybe I'll be a less abusive dictator." You've heard this story throughout your whole lives.

So what we have to do is somehow find a way for other countries from the outside and people like you from the inside to show these people who have come into the government, oftentimes from many years away from the Congo, if you will, a middle way, a way to—and the only way they can succeed—of

empowering people at the grassroots level and working out a less centralized approach.

And we will work very hard on it, because I believe that if the transition of the Congo away from Mobutu to a genuine democratic, functioning government could succeed, as vast and as wealthy as the country is—and with the horrible history of the last few years—it would be a stunning example to the rest of the continent, indeed, to places in other continents of the world. So it's a very important issue. And I thank you very much for it.

*[Amsatou Sow Sidibe, director of studies at the Peace and Human Rights Institute, Cheikh Anta Diop University of Dakar, described Senegal's strong democratic tradition as well as its ongoing problems in protecting the human rights of women and children, and requested U.S. support for education and implementation of the U.N. convention on women's rights. Constance Yai, from Cote d'Ivoire, reiterated that African governments and populations are hostile to women and stressed that the absence of women in decisionmaking bodies was a major concern and contributed to the continent's problems. Ayo Obe, president of the Civil Liberties Organization in Nigeria, said that Nigerians in the past took their freedom for granted, but that human rights abuses now have added to the country's economic collapse due to the corruption and inefficiency of its military dictatorship. Ms. Obe expressed cautious optimism concerning the upcoming general election but noted that Nigeria's five political parties are all created by and beholden to the government and have no independent ideology. She concluded that as neighboring African nations make strides in human rights, Nigeria will feel pressure to do the same.]*

**The President.** Let me say just very briefly, before I ask John to speak, that in all candor the question of Nigeria has been the most difficult for us to deal with, because it is the most populous country in Africa, because it has this incredible irony of having the vast oil resources and all the poverty and dislocation at home, and because every avenue we have tried to try to deal with the government of General Abacha has been frustrating to us.

And we even had—I think it's fair to say we've had some fairly heated debates among ourselves about, well, should we just continue having nothing to do with this man? Should we try to at least deal with him in the way we're working with President Kabila? What should we do? Because it is an incredible tragedy; you have this huge, diverse, rich country, in effect, being driven into the ground by political oppression and mismanagement.

And we have said that if there were a release of the political prisoners, if there were a genuine political process that was real, not just a military government in a suit and tie, that we would try to work with it. But by your comments, you know how difficult it is to exercise any constructive influence. And yet it's a great tragedy.

I mean, when I was in Ghana, and we were discussing energy problems—just to take the energy issue—I learned that the oil production in Nigeria is continuing to burn off the natural gas instead of to save it and to sell it to Nigerians or to others, when everyone who knows anything about energy knows that the natural gas is not only just as valuable as oil but less damaging to the environment and could help to provide huge amounts of money to Nigeria to alleviate the suffering of the people and lift the condition of the people. I just give that as one example.

We will continue to do what we can. We will continue to look for other avenues, and we will continue to encourage the other African governments to do the same. And the point you made about expecting it from South Africa but needing it from the others I think is a very important one.

*[John Makela, executive director of a media training institution in Mozambique, discussed the importance of strengthening the emerging media industry in African nations as a crucial arm of the democratization process. He said his native Zambia has a decent media presence but many other nations do not, either because of repressive governments, poor business and management skills, or both. Mr. Makela stressed the need for more widespread public discussion of issues and increased radio and Internet access, and concluded that the United States could help*

*Africa by supporting media training institutions.]*

**The President.** Thank you very much. Let me just, if I could, pick up on a couple of suggestions you made. First of all, the comment you made about radio struck me as particularly important. As we traveled around the country and got into some of the rural areas, I thought about that myself. But for all of you who are interested in this, I think that it is important that people like you get out ahead of this and come up with ideas about how you could use it in a beneficial way to advance democracy and human rights. Because one of the things I worry about is that in this ongoing struggle, that some of the people that are most hostile to what you believe in could one day hit upon the instrument of the radio to drive wedges between people.

That's been one of our biggest problems in Bosnia, where we're seeking to make peace, is that instruments of the media, the radio and the television, came totally into the hands of basically the people who had a stake in keeping the various ethnic groups at war with one another. And so they relentlessly use the radio to abuse the privilege of the airwaves, which in every country should belong to the public at large. It should be used for larger public purposes.

So I think that this is a cause, John, which you might make a common cause with other human rights groups around the continent, because I think it's very important. In the places which have no communications, including some of the villages that I have visited, it will come, and it's very important when it comes, how it comes. I cannot overestimate that to you, the importance of making sure that when this happens to the general population, that it is an instrument of education and enlightenment and bringing people together and empowering them, not just one more blunt weapon to beat them down and keep them apart.

Now, let me just say one other thing. When I listen to you all talk and putting this into the context of the larger trip, it is obvious that many, many great things are happening in Africa; that, if you look at them, you think there's an African renaissance. If you look at some of the problems you mentioned and

you realize some things we haven't talked about in great detail, the education, environmental, and economic problems, there's still a lot of crisis.

I had a meeting with young leaders in South Africa to discuss this, and I said that just observing all these places—and I went to two villages, I went to three different townships and neighborhoods in South Africa when I was there, apart from the cities and the official work. And it seems to me that there is a crying need for—you have a lot of leaders and potential leaders, not only people like you who have good educations and backgrounds but the people who stood up and were applauded here—they're leaders, too. And we would like to focus more on building the structures necessary for leadership to work.

There are the national structures you talked about, the press, the education system, all of that. But there's also the need to figure out how you can best channel the resources that might come from outside at the grass-roots level. We went to Dal Diam, the village here, yesterday, and we saw people essentially reclaiming the desert because someone gave them enough money to build a well. So one little village, they reclaimed 5 hectares of the desert. That's the way you reverse the growth of the desert, people do it, because they have to find a way to sustain their life as they do that.

So before we have to break up here, I would just like to say to all of you, I do not want this trip of ours to be an isolated event. I want it to be the beginning of a much more comprehensive and constructive role for the United States. So as you think about the structural issues—not just what can the President of the United States say to the leader of some other country—I want you to feel free, on your own behalf and for others with whom you come in contact, to contact us with very specific suggestions about what we can do to help people in your countries change their own lives, what kind of structural changes, supports, can be built in to build organized efforts such as the one we have celebrated today with the women and men who are here from the village that Hillary visited. I think it's very important.

We're about out of time, but I wonder if any of you have any other—any of you would like a second round of comments based on what you've heard before we adjourn. Is there anything else you would like to say to me or to each other?

Yes.

*[Ms. Sidibe asked why the United States has not ratified the convention on children's rights and a 1977 treaty on antipersonnel landmines.]*

**The President.** Well, let me, first of all, answer an earlier question you made. You made a lot of points about education in your earlier remarks, and we have announced a new initiative there. And I hope that—let me follow up on that just to say I hope you will think of other specific things we can do in that regard.

On the children's convention, the Senate of the United States has not ratified that because of a concern about one particular provision in it and how it relates to the sovereignty of our States in the United States. But we fully support its objectives and always have.

On the landmine issue, I don't know about the '77 convention. I can tell you that we, the United States, spend more than half of the money the whole world spends to take landmines out of the ground. We have already destroyed 1.5 million of our own landmines, and we are in the process of destroying our whole supply—with the single exception of those that are in a very carefully marked plot of land in Korea, at the border of North and South Korea. We leave them there—first of all, they're not near any residential area; they're not near any children; and the area where they are is heavily marked with warning; and no civilian has ever been hurt there—because the North Korean Army has vastly larger forces on the border of South Korea than the South Koreans and the Americans have facing them. And it's only about 18 miles from the border of North Korea to Seoul, the largest city in South Korea. And the landmines are thought to be the only presently available deterrent should an invasion occur, and no invasion has occurred.

We are there pursuant to the United Nations resolution of the conflict between North and South Korea. I think there is some encouragement that that may be resolved, that the final peace may be made. And when that happens, then the last remaining landmine issue will be resolved.

In the meanwhile, we will continue to do everything we can to end the problem of landmines for people everywhere. We will continue to spend the money that we're spending, to use the people that we're using—we, actually not very long ago, lost a crew of our Air Force—you may remember—in a tragic accident off the coast of Africa when they just deposited some American forces to take landmines up in southwest Africa. It was an airline accident, but they were there to deal with the landmine issue.

It is a very, very important thing to me, personally, and to our country. And we are trying to increase the number of people trained to take the mines up, and also increase the amount of equipment available. And interestingly enough, for the first time ever, our Defense Department has just recently purchased a machine made in South Africa that aids in the extraction of landmines from the ground. So we are working very, very hard on that.

*[A participant commended the President for having come to listen to Africans and not to tell them what to do, and encouraged him to support reconciliation through local and regional African mechanisms.]*

**The President.** Well, one of the things that we have learned the hard way, just from trying to solve social problems in our own country, is that there is a sense in which the people are always ahead of the leaders. And therefore, partnership is all that works. And certainly it's true for us coming here from a totally different experience.

I believe the United States, as I said when I got here, tended to view Africa too much through the very limited lens of the cold war for too long. And I believe that the world over has seen too much of Africa only in terms of the problems, when something bad happens. So I think—what I'm trying to do is to get the scales right, to see the problems and the promise and to develop a partnership



that makes sense, that will outlive my Presidency, that will fundamentally change forever the way the United States and Africa relate to one another.

It's heartbreaking to me that there are some situations for which I don't have a ready answer, the most painful and the biggest one being the one that we discussed with Nigeria. But I'm positive that if we have a consistent, ongoing effort and if we continue to listen and work together, that increasingly the promise will prevail over the problems.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:00 a.m. at the Hotel Le Meridien President. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Sani Abacha, Chairman, Federal Executive Council, Nigeria, and Constance Yai, president, Ivorian Association for the Defense of the Rights of Women. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

### **Memorandum on the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization**

*April 3, 1998*

Presidential Determination No. 98-20

#### *Memorandum for the Secretary of State*

*Subject:* Use of Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs Account Funds for the U.S. Contribution to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO)

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 614(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2364(a)(1), I hereby determine that it is important to the security interests of the United States to furnish up to \$30 million in funds made available under the heading "Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs" in title II of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1998 (Public Law 105-118) for the United States contribution to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization without regard to any provision of law within the scope of sec-

tion 614(a)(1). I hereby authorize the furnishing of such assistance.

You are hereby authorized and directed to transmit this determination to the Congress and to arrange for its publication in the *Federal Register*.

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

### **The President's Radio Address**

*April 4, 1998*

Good morning. The First Lady and I have just returned, exhausted but exhilarated, from our trip to Africa. I know that many of you traveled along with us day by day through television and the Internet, but I wish every American could have seen up close the renewed hope and restored pride that is evident in the six countries we visited. We saw parents building futures where their children will be free from want, free from injustice, free from disease, and free to go as far as their God-given talents will allow.

This morning, I want to report on the progress we're making in our country to free children from two of the greatest health and safety dangers they face: the cruel and deadly lure of smoking and the lethal combination of drinking and driving.

Three years ago, appalled by how many children were becoming addicted to cigarettes every year, the Vice President and I committed this administration to stopping the sale and marketing of cigarettes to children. Today, thanks to these efforts and the persistence of State attorneys general, the public health community, and leaders in Congress, we have the best opportunity ever to pass comprehensive antismoking legislation that will save millions of our children from a premature, painful, and very preventable death.

This week, in an historic and resounding 19 to 1 vote, a key Senate committee gave its stamp of approval to comprehensive legislation sponsored by Senator John McCain, a Republican, and Senator Fritz Hollings, a Democrat, that would cut youth smoking by half over the next decade. This bill represents a dramatic step forward. It would raise the

price of cigarettes, give the FDA full authority to regulate tobacco products, ban advertising aimed at children, and protect tobacco farmers.

We still have work to do on this legislation. Above all, we need to put in place tough penalties that will cost the tobacco industry if it continues to sell cigarettes to young people. Just this week the Centers for Disease Control released a disturbing report that found that more than a third of teenagers in the United States now smoke, even though it's illegal.

It is time to hold tobacco companies accountable. Reducing youth smoking must be everybody's bottom line. Let's remember, this is not about politics or money or seeking revenge against the tobacco industry for past practices. We're not trying to put the tobacco companies out of business. We want to put them out of the business of selling cigarettes to kids. This week's progress in the Senate shows we have real momentum in both parties to do just that.

Unfortunately, this week the Congress also took a step backward on efforts to cut down on drunk driving, a horror that has shaken nearly every American community. Republican leaders in the House blocked a full vote on an important measure to encourage States to adopt a stricter definition of drunk driving that has already passed the United States Senate. I urge the House leadership to reconsider its unwise action. A stricter definition of drunk driving will not prevent adults from drinking responsibly, but it will save thousands of lives.

There are fewer than 75 days remaining on Congress's legislative calendar. But as we saw this week in the Senate, when we set aside partisan differences and keep our eyes on the prize of dramatically improving our children's health, we can make remarkable progress in record time. There are still many issues to be worked out and many long nights ahead. But we have within our grasp one of the most important public health victories our Nation has ever achieved.

Finally, let me just pause a moment to observe the 30th anniversary of the death of one of America's greatest heroes, Dr. Martin Luther King. His dream, deeply rooted in the American dream, is a dream for all Amer-

icans. It's a dream, as I recently saw, shared by millions and millions of people around the world. Let us here at home always strive to heed Dr. King's words and live up to his legacy.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 10:50 a.m. on April 3 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 4.

### **Message to the Pilgrimage to Memphis Celebrating the Life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.**

*April 4, 1998*

Warm greetings to everyone participating in the Pilgrimage to Memphis. As we commemorate the 30th anniversary of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., I join you in celebrating his life and legacy.

Dr. King awakened the conscience of our nation and summoned us to join a pilgrimage from which we have never turned back. With clear vision and an eloquent voice, he called on all Americans simply to be true to our promises. He called on us to confront injustice and to overcome it. He called on us to free all our people from the indignity of discrimination and the pain of poverty. He called on us to engrave on our hearts the words that our founders inscribed on paper: that all of us are created equal.

Thirty years ago, Dr. King reassured us, in his final prophetic speech at Mason Temple Church of God in Christ, that he had seen the promised land and that "we, as a people, will get to the promised land." But he was wrong when he said, "I may not get there with you," for he is with us still. He is with us as we strive to build communities of hope and opportunity for all; he is with us when we give all our children the care and support and education they need to reach their God-given potential. And he will be with us when we enter the next millennium as One America—a better, stronger, and more united nation because of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, courage and sacrifice.

Hillary joins me in extending best wishes for a memorable observance.

**Bill Clinton**

NOTE: This message was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 4.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders  
Reporting on Iraq**  
*April 3, 1998*

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1) and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). This report covers the period from February 3, 1998, to the present.

**Introduction**

For much of the period covered by this report, Iraq was engaged in a serious challenge to the authority of the UNSC and the will of the international community. As documented in my last report, Iraq refused to allow U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM) inspectors to carry out their work at a number of sites last December; Iraq's refusal to cooperate in spite of repeated warnings continued until the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan and Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz on February 23, and the enforcement of this agreement by the UNSC on March 2 when it adopted UNSCR 1154. Both the MOU and UNSCR 1154 reiterate Iraq's commitment to provide immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to UNSCOM and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). UNSCR 1154 also stresses that any further Iraqi violation of the relevant UNSC resolutions would result in the severest consequences for Iraq. Iraq's commitment is now in the process of being tested. A series of UNSCOM inspections of so-called "sensitive" sites in early March proceeded without Iraqi interference. On March 26, UNSCOM inspections of the so-called "presidential sites" began under the arrangements agreed to by UNSCOM Chairman Richard Butler and Iraqi Deputy Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz. The team of 60 UNSCOM inspectors, accompanied by 20 diplomatic observers, is conducting inspec-

tions of the so-called "presidential sites" through April 5. Chairman Butler traveled to Baghdad in mid-March for discussions with Iraqi officials concerning Iraq's missile and chemical weapons programs.

Throughout the crisis created by Iraq's refusal to cooperate with U.N. weapons inspectors, the objective of my Administration was to achieve effective inspections, preferably through a diplomatic solution. Our vigorous diplomatic efforts were backed by the credible threat to use force, if necessary. I consulted with our allies in the region as well as with the other members of the U.N. Security Council. Secretary of State Albright, Secretary of Defense Cohen, U.N. Ambassador Richardson, and other Administration officials also pursued our objectives vigorously with foreign governments, including several trips to the region and to relevant capitals and at the United Nations. Our military forces responded quickly and effectively to support our diplomatic efforts by providing a credible military option, which we were prepared to use if Iraq had not ultimately agreed to meet its obligation to provide full access to UNSCOM and the IAEA.

***U.S. and Coalition Force Levels in the Gulf Region***

As a demonstration of U.S. resolve during the recent crisis with Iraq, the aircraft carriers USS INDEPENDENCE, USS GEORGE WASHINGTON, their accompanying battle group combatant ships, and additional combat aircraft have remained in the region. United States force levels in the region now include land- and carrier-based aircraft, surface warships, a Marine amphibious task force, Patriot missile battalions, a mechanized battalion task force, and a mix of special operations forces deployed in support of USCINCENT operations. To enhance force protection throughout the region, additional military security personnel are also deployed. These U.S. forces were augmented by the HMS ILLUSTRIOUS and accompanying ships from the United Kingdom.

In addition to the United Kingdom, a number of other nations have pledged forces to our effort to compel Iraq's compliance with its commitments. Although all of the

members of this international effort seek a peaceful diplomatic resolution of the crisis in Iraq, all have shown their resolve to achieve our common objective by military force if that becomes necessary. Without this demonstration of resolve to both use military force and impose the severest consequences on Iraq for any further Iraqi transgressions, it is unlikely that the MOU and UNSCR 1154 (see below) would have been achieved.

Twenty nations have deployed forces to the region or have readied their forces for contingency deployment. Those countries currently represented in the Gulf include Australia, Argentina, Canada, the Czech Republic, Kuwait, Netherlands, New Zealand, Romania, and the United Kingdom. Another 12 nations have offered important access, basing, overflight, and other assistance essential for the multi-national effort. Still others have identified force contributions that are being held in reserve for deployment should the need arise. United States and Allied forces in the region are prepared to deal with numerous contingencies, either conventional or weapons of mass destruction-related. UNSCR 949, adopted in October 1994, demands that Iraq not use its military forces to threaten its neighbors or U.N. operations in Iraq and that it not redeploy troops nor enhance its military capacity in southern Iraq. In view of Saddam's record of brutality and unreliability, it is prudent to retain a significant force presence in the region to deter Iraq. This gives us the capability to respond rapidly to possible Iraqi aggression or threats against its neighbors.

Until Iraqi intent to comply with the MOU is verified, it will be necessary to maintain our current augmented force posture in the region. The ongoing inspections of the so-called "presidential sites" mark the next critical phase in the UNSCOM inspections process. Once Iraqi compliance is assured, we will consider whether we can reduce our present force posture.

#### ***Operation Northern Watch and Operation Southern Watch***

The United States and coalition partners continue to enforce the no-fly zones over Iraq under Operation Northern Watch and Operation Southern Watch. In response to

a series of Iraqi no-fly zone violations in October and November 1997, we increased the number of aircraft participating in these operations. There have been no observed no-fly zone violations during the period covered by this report. We have repeatedly made clear to the Government of Iraq and to all other relevant parties that the United States and coalition partners will continue to enforce both no-fly zones, and that we reserve the right to respond appropriately and decisively to any Iraqi provocations.

#### ***The Maritime Interception Force***

The Maritime Interception Force (MIF), operating under the authority of UNSCR 665, vigorously enforces U.N. sanctions in the Gulf. The U.S. Navy is the single largest component of this international naval force, but it is augmented by ships and aircraft from Australia, Canada, Belgium, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. Member states of the Gulf Cooperation Council support the MIF by providing logistical support and shipriders, and accepting vessels caught violating sanctions.

Since my last report, the MIF has intercepted 15 sanctions violators in the Gulf for a total of over 25,000 metric tons of illegal Iraqi petroleum products. Ships involved in smuggling have often utilized the territorial seas of Iran to avoid MIF inspections. We have given detailed reports of these illegal activities to the U.N. Sanctions Committee in New York.

The level of petroleum smuggling from Iraq appears to be decreasing. There are indications, still preliminary, that the Government of Iran may be taking steps to curb the flow of illegal petroleum products through its territorial seas. While it is too early to tell if Iran will completely and permanently stop this illegal traffic, we are hopeful that Iran will help enforce the provisions of UNSCR 661 and other relevant UNSCRs. In this regard, we note that the Iranian government has recently played a helpful role in enforcing the sanctions of air travel to and from Iraq by requiring that planes wishing to enter Iraq obtain the appropriate approval from the U.N. Sanctions Committee before overflying Iranian territory.

Recent actions by the United Arab Emirates (UAE) will greatly enhance our efforts to halt illegal exports from Iraq. After diplomatic consultations with the United States and our MIF allies, the UAE has significantly increased its level of cooperation with the MIF. These efforts have resulted in a significant increase in the number of ships caught with illegal cargoes. In addition, the UAE has prohibited the use of tankers, barges, and other vessel types to transport petroleum products to UAE ports and through its waters or to store such products there. While it is still too early to determine the full effect of these measures, we are hopeful that these actions will deal a significant blow to sanctions-busting activity in the region.

While Iran and the UAE are taking positive steps, Iraq continues to improve loading facilities in the Shatt Al Arab waterway, which gives it the potential to smuggle even larger quantities of gasoil and fuel oil. The U.S. Government will seek to address this problem in the context of the expansion of the "oil-for-food" program approved under UNSCR 1153.

#### ***Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction: UNSCOM and the IAEA***

Iraq's refusal to cooperate fully and unconditionally with UNSCOM and the IAEA, which are tasked with tracking down and destroying Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs, was once again at the heart of the latest crisis between the U.N. and Iraq.

On February 23, the United Nations Secretary General signed the MOU with the Government of Iraq reiterating Iraq's obligation to cooperate fully and unconditionally with inspections by UNSCOM and IAEA for weapons of mass destruction. The agreement stipulates that Iraq will provide UNSCOM and IAEA weapons inspectors with immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any suspect site inside Iraq, including presidential palaces, and provides for specific procedures for inspections at eight clearly identified presidential sites.

The recent crisis with Iraq was only the latest chapter in the long history of efforts by the Iraqi regime to flout its obligations under relevant UNSC resolutions. Iraq has

persistently failed to disclose fully its programs for WMD. Iraq has admitted, when confronted with incontrovertible evidence, that it has repeatedly and consistently concealed information from UNSCOM and the IAEA and has moved significant pieces of dual-use equipment that are subject to monitoring in violation of its obligations. Without full disclosure and free access to all sites UNSCOM and IAEA wish to inspect, the ongoing monitoring and verification mandated by relevant UNSC resolutions, including Resolutions 687, 707, and 715, cannot effectively be conducted.

#### ***U.N. Security Council Resolution 1154***

On March 2, the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 1154, which welcomed the MOU and reiterated that Iraq must cooperate fully with UNSCOM and the IAEA. In the clearest possible terms, the Council warned Iraq in UNSCR 1154 that it will face the "severest consequences" if it fails to adhere to the commitments it reaffirmed in the MOU. This resolution is one of the strongest and clearest statements the Council has made in 7 years with regard to what Iraq must do to comply with its obligations, and what the consequences of failing to meet those obligations will be. This strong language of UNSCR 1154 is critical to ensuring that UNSCOM and IAEA can do their job and that Iraq is held accountable to its agreement. We welcomed Resolution 1154 and agreed with Secretary General Annan that, if respected, honored, and sustained, the agreement "could constitute one of the U.N.'s most important steps in addressing the consequences of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait 7 years ago."

Iraq's compliance with the agreement is now being tested. Since the beginning of March, UNSCOM has pursued an intensive agenda of inspections, including inspections of so-called "sensitive" sites and "presidential sites" to which the Iraqis had previously blocked access. Iraq has not significantly obstructed access to any sites UNSCOM and the IAEA wished to visit since the MOU was signed. This may mean Iraq will comply with the relevant UNSC resolutions, but the testing process must continue until UNSCOM and the IAEA are fully satisfied. We have

consistently stressed that full, unconditional, repeated access by UNSCOM to all sites, personnel, equipment, documents, and means of transportation provides the only means by which the world can make certain Iraq does not maintain or develop WMD. We have full faith and confidence in UNSCOM and its Executive Chairman.

### ***Biological and Chemical Weapons***

Iraqi biological and chemical weapons remain the most troubling issues for UNSCOM. This is due to the innate dual-use nature of the technology; it can easily be hidden within civilian industries such as, for biological agents, the pharmaceutical industry and, for chemical agents, the pesticide industry. UNSCOM is still unable to verify that all of Iraq's SCUD missile warheads filled with biological agents—anthrax and botulinum toxin—have been destroyed.

### ***Nuclear Weapons and Delivery Systems***

The Iraqi regime contends that UNSCOM and the IAEA should “close the books” on nuclear and missile inspections. But there are still many uncertainties and questions that need to be resolved. Iraq has never provided a full and accurate account of its indigenous efforts to develop nuclear weapons and prohibited long-range missiles. Among the many problems, Iraq has failed to answer critical questions on nuclear weapons design and fabrication, procurement, and centrifuge enrichment; failed to provide a written description of its post-war nuclear weapons procurement program; and failed to account for major engine components, special warheads, missing propellants, and guidance instruments that could be used to assemble fully operational missiles. Until Iraq complies with its obligation to provide a full accounting of these and other relevant aspects of its program, the questions must remain open.

### ***Iraq's Concealment Mechanisms***

The U.N. Special Commission's work must include vigorous efforts to expose Iraq's “Concealment Mechanism.” During the last 60 days, but before signature of the MOU, UNSCOM launched two special inspection teams that once again targeted this mechanism in order to ferret out WMD programs

and documents that UNSCOM—and we—believe Iraq stubbornly retains. Unfortunately, it became clear that the Iraqi government had no intention of cooperating with these inspections as specifically called for in the most recent UNSCRs on the topic—resolutions 1134 of October 23, 1997, and 1137 of November 12, 1997. The teams were stopped *en route*, denied access, and prevented from videotaping equipment movement or document-destruction activity at suspect sites.

In accordance with relevant UNSC resolutions, UNSCOM and the IAEA must be allowed to continue to investigate all aspects of Iraq's prohibited programs until they can verify that all relevant components have been destroyed under international supervision, and that all remaining capabilities have been eliminated. Without such verification, Iraq could quickly develop the ability to strike at any city in the region—and perhaps even as far as Europe—with weapons of mass destruction.

### ***Dual-Use Imports***

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1051 established a joint UNSCOM/IAEA unit to monitor Iraq's efforts to reacquire proscribed weapons. Iraq must notify the unit before it imports any items that can be used in both military and civilian applications. Similarly, U.N. members must provide timely notification of exports to Iraq of such dual-use items.

We continue to be concerned that Iraq's land borders are extremely porous. Iraq continues substantial trade with its neighbors. There is significant potential for evasion of sanctions by land routes, giving additional weight to our position that UNSCOM must have full and unconditional access to all locations and be allowed to inspect and monitor Iraqi compliance over time.

### ***The U.N.'s Oil-for-Food Program***

On February 20, the Security Council adopted resolution 1153, which expands to \$5.2 billion the amount of oil Iraq is authorized to sell every 6 months. The previous amount was \$2.0 billion every 6 months. Resolution 1153 states that the nutritional and health requirements of the Iraqi people are

the top priority and allocates \$1 billion to rebuild hospitals, schools, water, and sanitation facilities. My Administration's support for resolution 1153 is fully consistent with long-standing U.S. policy. Since 1990, at the height of the Gulf War, the United States has held that the international community's dispute is with Iraq's leadership, not its people. We proposed an "oil-for-food" program in 1991 (UNSCR 706/712), which Iraq rejected. A similar program (UNSCR 986) was eventually accepted by Iraq in 1996. We supported the expansion of the oil-for-food program under UNSCR 1153 because it will provide additional humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people, under strict U.N. supervision, without benefiting the regime.

Since the beginning of the oil-for-food program, we have consistently worked with the U.N. and other U.N. member states to find ways to improve the program's effectiveness to better meet the humanitarian needs of Iraq's civilian population. Iraq, however, has frequently failed to provide the full cooperation necessary to ensure that the program functions smoothly. For example, during calendar year 1997, the Government of Iraq refused to pump oil under UNSCR 986 for more than 3 months, all the while blaming the U.N. and the United States for disruptions in the flow of food and medicine that it had caused. We will be watching closely to determine how the Government of Iraq performs under UNSCR 1153. The Iraqi government refused to provide appropriate input to the Secretary General's report of January 30 on Iraq's humanitarian needs, which provided the basis for determining allocations under UNSCR 1153. On February 5, Iraq sent its official "observations" on that report to the Secretary General, rejecting many of its proposals and recommendations to alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people without stating whether or not the Government of Iraq would "accept" the resolution. The U.N. Secretariat continues to work to reach agreement with Iraq on implementing UNSCR 1153.

Among its other provisions, UNSCR 1153 calls for an independent assessment of Iraq's oil infrastructure to ascertain whether it can export enough oil to cover the \$5.2 billion oil export ceiling. Based on this report, the

Secretary General will recommend to the UNSC whether repairs to Iraq's oil infrastructure will be needed to meet the new export target. The United States is prepared to support only those oil infrastructure repairs needed to fund the expanded humanitarian program.

The U.N. must carefully monitor how Iraq implements resolution 1153. The Iraqi government continues to insist on the need for rapid lifting of the sanctions regime, despite its record of non-compliance with its obligations under relevant U.N. resolutions. Saddam Hussein has exploited the suffering he himself has imposed on his people to build sympathy for Iraq and its government and to create pressure to lift the sanctions. In the meantime, he has continued to build lavish palaces that benefit only the elite within his regime.

#### ***War Crimes and The Human Rights Situation in Iraq***

The human rights situation throughout Iraq continues to be a cause for grave concern. U.N. Special Rapporteur for Iraq, Max Van der Stoep, is investigating credible reports from numerous independent sources that the Government of Iraq may have summarily executed hundreds—perhaps thousands—of political detainees in November and December 1997. According to these reports, many of those killed were serving sentences of 15–20 years for such crimes as insulting the regime or being members of an opposition political party. Families in Iraq reportedly received the bodies of the executed that bore, in some cases, clear signs of torture. In addition, the possibility that the government used humans as experimental subjects in its chemical and biological weapons programs remains a grave concern.

In southern Iraq, the government continues to repress the Shi'a population, destroying the Marsh Arabs' way of life and the unique ecology of the southern marshes. In the north, the government continues the forced expulsion of tens of thousands of ethnic Kurds from Kirkuk and other cities. The government continues to stall and obfuscate, rather than work in good faith toward accounting for more than 600 Kuwaitis and third-country nationals who disappeared at

the hands of Iraqi authorities during or after the occupation of Kuwait, and the nearly 5,000 Iranian prisoners of war taken prisoner by Iraq during the Iran-Iraq war. The Government of Iraq shows no sign of complying with UNSCR 688, which demands that Iraq cease the repression of its own people. The U.N. Special Rapporteur reported to the General Assembly his particular concern that extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, and the practice of torture continue to occur in Iraq.

### ***The INDICT Campaign***

The INDICT campaign continues to gain momentum. Led by various independent Iraqi opposition groups and nongovernmental organizations, this effort seeks to document crimes against humanity and other violations of international humanitarian law committed by the Iraqi regime. We applaud the tenacity of the Iraqi opposition in the face of one of the most repressive regimes in history. We take note of, and welcome, Senate Resolution 179 of March 13 expressing the sense of the Senate concerning the need for an international criminal tribunal to try members of the Iraqi regime for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

March 16, 1998, marked the tenth anniversary of the Iraqi military's devastating chemical attack on the Iraqi Kurdish town of Halabja. As many as 5,000 civilians were killed. More than 10,000 were injured. The Iraqi regime never expressed remorse for Halabja. In fact, the regime defended its use of chemical weapons in its war with Iran by claiming, "every nation has the right to protect itself against invasion," even though a 1925 Geneva Protocol, to which Iraq is subject, outlaws the use of chemical weapons. Ten years after the massacre, the people of Halabja still suffer from the effects of the attack, including much higher rates of serious diseases (such as cancer), birth defects, and miscarriages. The sympathies of the United States are with the people of Halabja and other victims of Iraqi chemical attacks as we remind ourselves and the international community that the U.N. must remain vigilant to stop Iraq from reacquiring weapons of mass destruction.

### ***Northern Iraq***

In northern Iraq, the cease-fire between the Kurdish parties, established in November 1997 as the result of U.S. efforts, continues to hold. Both Massoud Barzani, leader of the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP) and Jalal Talabani, leader of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) have made positive, forward-looking statements on political reconciliation, and talks between the two groups have commenced. We will continue our efforts to reach a permanent reconciliation through mediation in order to help the people of northern Iraq find the permanent, stable settlement that they deserve, and to minimize the opportunities for Baghdad and Tehran to insert themselves into the conflict and threaten Iraqi citizens in this region.

### ***The United Nations Compensation Commission***

The United Nations Compensation Commission (UNCC), established pursuant to UNSCRs 687 and 692, continues to resolve claims against Iraq arising from Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The UNCC has issued almost 1.3 million awards worth \$6 billion. Thirty percent of the proceeds from the oil sales permitted by UNSCRs 986, 1111, and 1143 have been allocated to the Compensation Fund to pay awards and to finance operations of the UNCC. To the extent that money is available in the Compensation Fund, initial payments to each claimant are authorized for awards in the order in which the UNCC has approved them, in installments of \$2,500. To date, 457 U.S. claimants have received an initial installment payment, and payment is in process for an additional 323 U.S. claimants.

### ***Conclusion***

Iraq remains a serious threat to international peace and security. I remain determined to see Iraq comply fully with all of its obligations under U.N. Security Council resolutions. The United States looks forward to the day when Iraq rejoins the family of nations as a responsible and law-abiding member.

I appreciate the support of the Congress for our efforts and shall continue to keep the



Congress informed about this important issue.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 6.

### **Remarks on the Assault Weapons Ban**

*April 6, 1998*

Thank you very much, Secretary Rubin. Thank you for your efforts. Madam Attorney General, thank you. Mr. Vice President, thank you. And to the members of the law enforcement community and Secretary Kelly, Mr. Magaw, Attorney General Miller, Congressman Engel, to representatives of Handgun Control and the victims of violent crime, and to all of you who have come here today, I thank you very much.

As the Vice President and the Attorney General and the Secretary of Treasury have said, 5 years ago we made a commitment as an administration to recover our Nation's streets from crime and violence, to provide security for our families and our children. It required a new determination by communities and by Government. It took a new philosophy of law enforcement, based not on tough talk, which was always in ample supply, but on tough action and smart action, a philosophy based simply on what works, community policing, strong antigang efforts, targeted deterrence, smarter, tougher penalties, a comprehensive strategy that includes all these elements and puts community policing at its core.

We're well on our way to putting 100,000 new police officers on the street, ahead of schedule. And as the Vice President just told us, crime rates are dropping all across America to a 25-year low. Violent crime is down; property crime is down; and murder is down dramatically. From the crime bill to the Brady bill, from the assault weapons ban to the Violence Against Women Act, our strategy is showing results. And Americans should take both pride and comfort in this progress.

But statistics tell only part of the story. The real measure of our progress is whether responsibility and respect for the law are on the rise. The real test of our resolve is whether parents can unlock their front doors with confidence and let their children play in the front yard without fear. And the fact remains that there are still far too many children in harm's way, too many families behind locked doors, too many guns in the hands of too many criminals.

No statistics can measure the pain or the brave resilience of the families shattered by gun violence. Some of them are here with us today, and I would like to acknowledge them, people like Dan Gross, Tawanna Matthews, Brian Miller, Byrl Phillips-Taylor. Byrl's 17-year-old son was killed with an AK-47. Tragedies like theirs are a brutal reminder of the task still before us. They are a challenge and a call to action that we as a nation cannot ignore, and I thank these people for being willing to continue the fight through their pain. Thank you very much, all of you. *[Applause]* Thank you.

If we are going to move forward in building a safer, stronger America, all of us, police and parents, communities and public officials, must work together. We must remain vigilant. Last November, I asked the Treasury Department to conduct the thorough review Secretary Rubin has just presented. That is why our administration has concluded that the import of assault weapons that use large-capacity military magazines should be banned. As everyone knows, you don't need an Uzi to go deer hunting. You don't need an AK-47 to go skeet shooting. These are military weapons, weapons of war. They were never meant for a day in the country, and they are certainly not meant for a night on the streets. Today we are working to make sure they stay off our streets.

Two successive administrations have acted on this principle. In 1989 President Bush banned the import of 43 semi-automatic assault rifles. In 1994 this administration banned the domestic manufacture of certain assault weapons. And in Congress, Senator Dianne Feinstein and the late Congressman Walter Capps led the fight against foreign gun manufacturers who evade the law. As long as those manufacturers can make minor

cosmetic modifications to weapons of war, our work is not done. And we must act swiftly and strongly.

That is what Secretary Rubin's announcement amounts to today. We are doing our best to say, you can read the fine print in our law and our regulations all you want, and you can keep making your minor changes, but we're going to do our best to keep our people alive and stop you from making a dollar in the wrong way.

It is our sworn duty to uphold the law, but it is also our moral obligation—our obligation to the children and families of law-abiding citizens, an obligation to stop the terrible scourge of gun violence. As parents, we teach our children every day to distinguish right from wrong. As a nation, we must also remember where to draw the line.

Today we draw it clearly and indelibly. If we do this, if we follow the recommendations set forth in this report, we chart the right course for America, toward a future more free of fear and a new century brimming with confidence and great promise.

Again, to all of you who played any role in this important day, I thank you on behalf of the people and the children and the future of the United States. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:55 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Raymond W. Kelly, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement; John W. Magaw, Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; and Iowa Attorney General Thomas J. Miller.

### **Remarks Honoring Major League Soccer Champions D.C. United and an Exchange With Reporters**

*April 6, 1998*

**The President.** Thank you very much. Welcome to the Rose Garden on this beautiful spring afternoon, Congresswoman Norton, Mrs. Barry, Councilman Evans.

In addition to being a magnificent spring day, this is also National Student Athlete Day. So I want to give a special welcome to those who have joined us to celebrate the achievements of students across the country. I want to thank Richard Lapchick, the direc-

tor of the Center for the Study of Sport in Society at Northeastern University, and Ron Stratten of the NCAA for your work to promote academics, athletics, and community service among our Nation's youth.

I also want to welcome Kevin Payne, the president and general manager of D.C. United, and Coach Bruce Arena and the members and the staff of this very talented team. You've all worked hard to make D.C. United the most successful team in Major League Soccer history, winners of the 1996 and 1997 MLS Cups. Each year, despite torrential rains during the championship games, you've shown us you are strongly united. And with a great record this season, you're well on your way to a "threepeat," something the law prevents me from trying to equal. [Laughter]

D.C. United and Major League Soccer are making soccer more and more popular in the United States, especially among young people. Last year a record 3.2 million children across our Nation played youth soccer, more than any other sport. My daughter taught me all I know about soccer. It was a great experience for me to watch her grow up in her soccer league, and I know it's making a difference in the lives of millions of children all across this country.

D.C. United is linking America to the world and the love of soccer in bringing Americans of all backgrounds together and, unless my ears have given out on me entirely, bringing some people beyond America together on this team. Last year, despite those rains, over 57,000 fans went to RFK Stadium to watch you win the championship. The D.C. United fans come from nearly every country on Earth. Their diversity and spirit add to the life of this, our Capital City, as I'm sure the representatives here would attest. Kevin Payne says that the fans are the 12th man in your winning efforts.

We can also all be proud of how united you are with the community of Washington, DC. Your partnership with DC Scores supports after school reading and writing programs, combined with the joys of playing soccer. And I'd like to give you a special thanks for that.

I also want to acknowledge the winners of that program's essays contest who are here

with us today—and they're standing over here—Anoa Hunter and Aton Kent-Trout, who wrote outstanding essays on "What United Means to Me." I just read their essays. I wish all of you could read them. I think it's an inspiring and important question for all of us to think about.

Congratulations to all of you, and now I'd like to turn it over to D.C. United's president, Kevin Payne.

Kevin.

*[At this point, Mr. Payne and Coach Arena made brief remarks, and the President was presented with an official team jersey advertising Major League Soccer's primary sponsor, Mastercard.]*

**The President.** I'll have to stay current on my Mastercard if I wear this—*[laughter]*—I like it. Thank you.

Thank you very much. Let me—before we close and I walk over here and we take a formal picture with the team—again thank the First Lady of Washington, DC, and Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton, and all the DC City Council members. I see at least three that I overlooked the first time. Would all the members of the DC City Council who are here stand up? I think they're all here. *[Applause]* Thank you. We have a quorum in case any of you have a particular problem you'd like solved. *[Laughter]*

And I'd also like to ask the student athletes and the coaches that I just honored in the Oval Office who have come here from around the country, who have done outstanding things. Many of them have overcome considerable personal obstacles to be outstanding athletes, outstanding students, and servants in their communities. I'd like to ask them to all stand please. *[Applause]* Thank you very much.

We're going to take a quick picture, and then we'll be adjourned. You can all stand up. We'll visit a little, have a little fun. Come on.

*[At this point, the President posed for photographs with the team.]*

### **Middle East Peace Process**

**Q.** Mr. President, is another Middle East peace summit here a possibility? Chairman

Arafat, Prime Minister Netanyahu left open that possibility. Would you consider it?

**The President.** We're working on it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:37 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Cora Masters Barry, wife of Mayor Marion Barry; Ward 2 Councilmember Jack Evans, District of Columbia Council; Ronald J. Stratten, group executive director for education services, NCAA; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

### **Statement on the Resignation of Federico Peña as Secretary of Energy**

*April 6, 1998*

Earlier today, with regret, I accepted Secretary of Energy Federico Peña's resignation.

Secretary Peña has admirably served my administration, first as Secretary of Transportation and then as Secretary of Energy. It is a measure of my confidence in his abilities that I entrusted him to run not one but two Cabinet agencies.

In his last year he diligently managed the Energy Department, focusing on energy, environmental quality, national security, and science and technology issues. Just last week Secretary Peña unveiled our Comprehensive Electricity Competition Plan, saving consumers \$20 billion per year, by introducing competition into the electricity industry. Under his leadership, the Department of Energy provided much of the analysis that gave me the confidence that we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions without harming the economy.

In the last year he helped shape our policy in the Caspian region, building a coalition among the key nations in that region; he provided a comprehensive national energy strategy for the Nation that will help ensure that Americans have affordable, clean, and secure energy supplies in the 21st century; and he privatized Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve, generating \$3.65 billion for U.S. taxpayers.

During his 4 years at the Transportation Department, Secretary Peña increased the

level of competitiveness of America's transportation industry with more investments in mass transit than at any time since Woodrow Wilson was President. Secretary Peña helped to improve travel safety, signed aviation agreements with 40 nations, opened lucrative markets for American airlines, and oversaw a 25 percent increase in infrastructure investments.

I wish Secretary Peña, his wife, Ellen, and their three children the best for the future. I thank him for his invaluable service as a member of my Cabinet.

**Statement on British and French Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty**

*April 6, 1998*

Today, France and Great Britain deposited their instruments of ratification for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in New York, thus becoming the first nuclear weapon states to ratify the CTBT.

I applaud this milestone in the global effort to reduce the nuclear threat and build a safer world. In particular, I want to thank Prime Minister Blair and President Chirac and the Parliaments of Great Britain and France for their leadership in paving the way towards early entry into force of this historic treaty.

The CTBT has now been signed by 149 states, including all 5 nuclear weapon states. In my State of the Union Address, I asked the Senate to give its advice and consent to the CTBT this year. The CTBT is in the best interests of the United States because its provisions will significantly further our nuclear nonproliferation and arms control objectives and strengthen international security.

**Statement on the Breast Cancer Prevention Trial**

*April 6, 1998*

Today's new research findings about the potential use of the drug tamoxifen to prevent breast cancer are an historic step in the ongoing fight against this deadly disease. Breast cancer strikes one in eight American

women, and about 180,000 women in the United States will be diagnosed with breast cancer in 1998. Each of us has a sister, a daughter, a friend, or in my case, a mother, who has fought against it.

The landmark Breast Cancer Prevention Trial gives us new hope that some women at high risk for breast cancer may actually be able to reduce their risk of getting this life threatening disease. It is an important contribution to our national battle to detect, prevent, treat, and finally cure breast cancer for generations of women to come.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979**

*April 6, 1998*

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 7.

**Remarks to the National Forum on Social Security in Kansas City, Missouri**

*April 7, 1998*

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Good morning. Thank you, Governor Carnahan, for your leadership on so many areas and your friendship. I'd like to thank

the leaders of this fine institution for welcoming us here and for the mission they perform every day. I thank Senators Kerrey and Santorum for their concern—longstanding—for Social Security reform and their presence here, and Representatives Hulshof and Pomeroy, who are participating in the program, and Representative McCarthy and also Representative David Dreier from California, who is a native of Kansas City, who are here.

I thank the members of our administration who have come, who will be participating: the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Frank Raines; the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, Larry Summers; the Director of the National Economic Council, Gene Sperling; and the Administrator of Social Security, Ken Apfel.

Attorney General Nixon, Treasurer Graeber, Insurance Commissioner Sebelius, thank you all for being here. Mayor Cleaver, thank you for hosting us. I don't know if Mayor Marinovich is here or not, but if she is, hello. [*Laughter*]

I'd also like to thank the leaders of the AARP, including Horace Deets, and the leaders of the Concord Coalition, including Martha Phillips, for their hosting of this forum. The AARP has long been a leading voice for the elderly, the Concord Coalition long a leading voice for fiscal responsibility over the long run, and their willingness to work together is very important. I'd also like to thank the Speaker of the House, the Senate majority leader, and the House and Senate Democratic leaders for nominating and being represented here today by the Members of Congress who are on the program.

As the Governor said, this is a good time for America and a time of great hope. Our economy is the strongest in a generation. Many of our social problems are on the mend. Our leadership in the world is unrivaled. Within the next year, we will have a balanced budget. And where once there were deficits projected as far as the eye can see, we now have projected surpluses as far as the eye can see, a trillion dollars' worth over the next decade.

But this sunlit moment is not a time to rest. Instead, it is a rare opportunity to prepare our Nation for the challenges and the opportunities of the 21st century, or in the

words of the old saying, to fix the roof while the sun is shining. In the coming century, the aging of our society will present both great challenges and great opportunities. I hope to live to be one of those people and so, to me, it's a high-class problem.

But because a higher percentage of our people will be both older and retired, perhaps our greatest opportunity and our greatest obligation at this moment is to save Social Security. In the State of the Union Address, I called on Congress to set aside every penny of any surplus until we had dealt with Social Security first. Both parties in both Chambers of Congress have joined in this call. That is the good news.

Today we turn to the business at hand, building public awareness of the nature and scope of the problem and building public consensus for the best changes. Clearly, we will strengthen Social Security and reform it only if we reach across lines of party, philosophy, and generation. And that is one reason for the broad representation of age groups in this audience today. We have to have open minds and generous spirits. And we all have to be willing to listen and to learn.

For too long, politicians have called Social Security the "third rail" of American politics. That's Washington language for "it's above serious debate." This year we must prove them wrong. This conference, with its wide participation, is a good start. On the political calendar, 1998 is an election year. But on the Social Security calendar, we must resolve to make it an education year, when we come to grips with the problems of the system and come together to find the answers.

This issue is complicated, so we need the best ideas, whatever their source. The issue is controversial, so we have to have a national consensus on both the nature of the problem and the direction we must take.

That's why I've asked all the Members of Congress to also host townhall meetings in their own districts. I'll be talking with several of them by satellite later today, and we'll hold more additional forums like this one around the country. In December there will be a White House Conference on Social Security. In January I intend to convene the leaders of Congress to draft a plan to save it. With

this effort, we can forge a national consensus, and we must.

For 60 years, Social Security has meant more than an ID number on a tax form, more than even a monthly check in the mail. It reflects our deepest values, the duties we owe to our parents, to each other, to our children and grandchildren, to those who misfortune strikes, to our ideals as one America.

Missouri's native son, Mark Twain, once said, "I've come loaded with statistics, for I've noticed a man can't prove anything without statistics." So I thought we would begin today with a few statistics. Today, as the first chart shows, 44 million Americans depend upon Social Security, and for two-thirds of our senior citizens, it is the main source of income. For 18 percent of our seniors, it is the only source of income.

But Social Security is more than just a retirement program. Today you can see that more than one in three of the beneficiaries are not retirees; they are children and spouses of working people who die in their prime; they are men and women who become disabled, or their children.

So Social Security is also a life insurance policy and a disability policy, as well as a rock-solid guarantee of support in old age. That is why we have to act with care as we make needed repairs to the program occasioned by the huge growth in retirees.

Since its enactment over 60 years ago, Social Security has changed the face of America. When President Roosevelt signed the bill creating the Social Security system, most seniors in America were poor. A typical elderly person sent a letter to FDR begging him to eliminate "the stark terror of penniless old age." Since then, the elderly poverty rate has dropped sharply. You can look here and see that in 1959 the poverty rate was over 35 percent for retirees. In 1979 it had dropped to 15.2 percent. In 1996 the poverty rate is down below 11 percent.

Now, there's something else I want to say about this. Even though most seniors need other sources of income in addition to Social Security to maintain a comfortable lifestyle, if Social Security did not exist today, half of all American retirees would be living in poverty—60 percent of all women. Fifteen million American seniors have been lifted out

of poverty through the Social Security system.

Today the system is sound, but the demographic crisis looming is clear. The baby boomers, 76 million of us, are now looking ahead to their retirement. And people, clearly, are living longer, so that by 2030, there will be twice as many elderly as there are today.

All these trends will impose heavy strains on the system. Let's look at the next chart here. You can see that in 1960—wasn't so long ago—there were over five people working for every person drawing Social Security. In 1997, last year, there were over three people—3.3 people—working for every person drawing. But by 2030, because of the increasing average age, if present birthrates and immigration rates and retirement rates continue, there will be only two people working for every person drawing Social Security.

Now, here's the bottom line: The Social Security Trust Fund is sufficient to pay all the obligations of Social Security—both retirement and disability—until 2029, after which it will no longer cover those obligations. Payroll contributions will only be enough to cover 75 cents on the dollar of current benefits.

Now, if we act now, we can ensure strong retirement benefits for the baby boom generation without placing an undue burden on our children and grandchildren. And we can do it, if we act now, with changes that will be far simpler and easier than if we wait until the problem is closer at hand. For example, a \$100 billion of the budget surplus, if used for Social Security, would add a year or more to the solvency of the Trust Fund with no other changes being made. Other changes which could be made can be phased in over time, and keep in mind, small changes decided on now can have huge impacts 30 years from now.

So how should we judge the proposals to change the Social Security system? Here are principles that I believe we should follow, and they're on the next chart here. I believe, first of all, we have to reform Social Security in a way that strengthens and protects a guarantee for the 21st century. We should not abandon a basic program that has been one

of the greatest successes in our country's history.

Second, we should maintain universality and fairness. For half a century, this has been a progressive guarantee for citizens; we have to keep it that way. It was not until 1985 that the poverty rate among seniors was lower than the poverty rate for the population of America as a whole. It is an astonishing achievement of our society that it is now so much lower, and we should not give it up.

Third, Social Security must provide a benefit that people can count on. Regardless of the ups and downs of the economy or the financial markets, we have to provide a solid and dependable foundation of retirement security.

Fourth, Social Security—continue to provide financial security for disabled and low income beneficiaries. We can never forget the one in three Social Security beneficiaries who are not retirees.

And fifth, anything we do to strengthen Social Security now must maintain our hard-won fiscal discipline. It is the source of much of the prosperity we enjoy today.

Now, these are the principles that will guide me as we work to forge a consensus. I hope they're ones that all of you can also embrace. This national effort will call on the best of our people. It will require us to rise above partisanship. It will require us to plan for the future, to consider new ideas, to engage in what President Roosevelt once called "bold, persistent experimentation." It will remind us that there are some challenges that we can only meet as one nation acting through our National Government, just as there are others we can better meet as individuals, families, communities.

This is also a challenge for every generation. To the older Americans here today, let me say, you have nothing to worry about. For you, Social Security is as strong as ever.

To the younger people here today who may believe that you will never see a Social Security check—indeed, I saw a poll which purported to be serious that said that Americans in their twenties thought it was more likely they would see a UFO than that they would ever draw Social Security. [Laughter] That skepticism may have been well founded

in the past, but just as we put our fiscal house in order, we can and must put Social Security in order.

And above all, to my fellow baby boomers, let me say that none of us wants our own retirement to be a burden to our children and to their efforts to raise our grandchildren. It would be unconscionable if we failed to act, and act now, as one nation renewing the ties that bind us across the generations.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. in the gymnasium at Penn Valley Community College. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri; Jay Nixon, Missouri State attorney general; Clyde D. Graeber, Kansas State treasurer; Kathleen Sebelius, Kansas State insurance commissioner; Mayor Emanuel Cleaver II of Kansas City, MO; Mayor Carol Marinovich of Kansas City, KS; Horace B. Deets, executive director, American Association of Retired Persons (AARP); and Martha Phillips, executive director, Concord Coalition.

### **Teleconference Remarks to Regional Social Security Forums from Kansas City**

*April 7, 1998*

**The President.** Good afternoon. Thank you, Ken. As Ken said, I'm speaking to you from Kansas City, where we're talking about what we must do as a nation to strengthen Social Security for the 21st century, and I'm looking forward to continuing to talk with you today.

Let me begin by thanking Representatives Bob Borski, Ben Cardin, Nancy Johnson, Jim Kolbe, and Jerry Weller for holding these town meetings across our Nation. For each of you lawmakers, these forums are not the only way you've worked to strengthen Social Security. Representatives Borski and Cardin are cosponsors of key legislation to establish the "Save Social Security First Reserve Fund." Representative Borski supports saving any budgetary surplus for investment in Social Security, and I know Representative Cardin does as well.

Now, Representative Johnson has been a strong advocate for Social Security beneficiaries. She has urged her fellow Members

of Congress to continue to act with fiscal restraint as they debate what to do with the budget surplus. Representative Kolbe is one of our foremost experts on retirement and pension policy and is the sponsor of a resolution to establish a joint commission on Social Security reform. And Representative Weller has been a powerful voice for protecting the Social Security Trust Fund and was an original cosponsor of the Social Security Preservation Act.

Together, all of you are proving that we can work in a bipartisan way to make sure that Social Security is as solid for our children as it was for our parents, and I thank you for that.

As you know, this year, working together with Congress, we'll be balancing the budget for the first time in 30 years. We have a right to be proud of that achievement, but we must also build on it. In the State of the Union, I called on Congress to set aside every penny of any budget surplus until we save Social Security first. Social Security is deeply woven into our Nation's social fabric. For 60 years, it's meant more than an ID number on a tax form, even more than a monthly check in the mail. It reflects our deepest values and the duties we owe to one another.

Today, 44 million Americans depend upon Social Security. For two-thirds of our seniors, it's the main source of income, and one in three beneficiaries are nonretirees. Social Security is life insurance and disability benefits as well as a rock-solid foundation of retirement security.

Today, Social Security is sound, but a demographic crisis looms if we fail to act. For over the next 30 years, 76 million baby boomers will retire. By 2030 there will be twice as many elderly Americans as there are today. If we don't act now, by then payroll contributions will only cover 75 percent of benefits. That's why I've challenged our Nation to act now to strengthen Social Security for the 21st century.

Here are the principles I want to follow for meeting this challenge. First, any reform should strengthen and protect Social Security for the 21st century. We can't abandon the basic core program that's been one of the great successes of our Nation's history.

Second, we must maintain the universality and the fairness of Social Security. For a half-century this program has been a progressive guarantee for citizens. We have to keep it that way.

Third, Social Security must provide a benefit people can count on. Regardless of the ups and downs of the economy or the financial markets, we must make certain that Social Security will provide a foundation of retirement security.

Fourth, Social Security must continue to provide financial security for disabled and low income beneficiaries. We can never forget the one out of three Social Security beneficiaries who aren't retirees.

And fifth, any strengthening of Social Security must maintain America's hard-won fiscal discipline, one of the main reasons we're enjoying our prosperity today.

These are the five principles that will guide me on Social Security, principles by which I'll judge all possible proposals. They're principles I believe can and should guide us all as we work to forge a national consensus for reform.

Above all, I know that we can strengthen Social Security only if we reach across the lines of party, philosophy, and generation with open minds and generous spirits. For too long, politicians have called Social Security the "third rail" of American politics. That's Washington language for "You can't really discuss any changes seriously." This year we have to prove them wrong.

I know that on the political calendar, 1998 is an election year. But on the Social Security calendar, let's all resolve to make 1998 an education year, a year we come to grips with the problems of the system and come together to find the answers. These forums are a very hopeful beginning, and I'm pleased to have had this chance to start this vitally important dialog with all of you today. This December we'll host a White House Conference on Social Security, and in January I'll convene the leaders of Congress to draft a plan to save Social Security for the 21st century.

I'm confident we'll meet this challenge as Americans always do—by working together,



honoring our values, and preserving the solemn compact between generations that helped to build our Nation.

Now I'd like to turn the discussion over to Congressman Borski. Bob, take it away.

*[At this point, Representatives hosting the regional forums each made brief remarks.]*

**The President.** Thank you very much, Congressman. Let me try to go back over some of what all of you said.

First of all, Congressman Cardin talked about the need to increase private saving; some others did. Congressman Borski talked about the fact that there were still some people on Social Security living in poverty. Let me try to address those things together, along with some of the other concerns which were mentioned. It is true that there are still about 11 percent of our elderly people in America living in poverty. But it's important to recognize that that's a lower percentage than in the overall population in America, and that it's just been since 1985 that the poverty rate among seniors was lower than the overall poverty rate.

Now, what can we do to make it better? There have to be other sources of income. There have to be other sources of private savings. And that is—of course, the possibility that some part of that could come out of Social Security reform is one of the things we're discussing.

But over and above that, I'd like to point out that Congress has done a lot of work with our administration over the last 5 years, first of all, to save 8.5 million pensions that were under water when I took office, to stabilize 40 million others, and to make it increasingly more attractive for employees on modest wages and for small business employers to take out 401(k) plans, and then to make it easier for people to move from job to job and take their 401(k) with them. We've also dramatically expanded the availability of IRA's.

So we've tried to do some things already to help increase the ability and the attractiveness of saving, over and above Social Security. I don't think—no matter what we do with Social Security, the American people are going to have to be sensitized,

the younger generation is, to do more to save for their own retirement.

On the other hand, I think it would be a great mistake, even for the youngest members of these audiences today, to believe that we shouldn't preserve Social Security as a universal guarantee. Because without Social Security today, almost half the seniors in America would be living in poverty, even though most seniors have income over and above that. So the trick is to save Social Security but also to have more income coming to people from private savings.

Now, let me mention just one or two other things. Nancy Johnson talked about wanting—made one Medicare statement about annual physicals. I believe that more and more, as people live to older ages and are healthier, we'll have to do more preventive care within the Medicare program. Nancy, you know, we've worked hard to deal with—to have more mammographies, for example. We're doing other preventive screening now. I think the more of that we do, the more we're going to save over the long run. And more importantly, we'll improve the length and the quality of life.

And she said, "People want to know whether the seniors can count on Social Security." The answer to that is, absolutely, yes. The Social Security Trust Fund, according to Mr. Apfel, who has got a legal responsibility to tell the truth about it, is stable until 2029. In 2029, shortly thereafter, the taxes coming in will only cover about 75 percent of our obligations. One of the reasons we want to move now is that by making relatively modest changes now we can extend the life of the Social Security Trust way out beyond 2029.

Can young people, the high school students here, look forward to drawing Social Security? The answer to that is, they certainly can if we do our jobs here in the next several months. You know, a few years ago, I can understand your skepticism because we were running huge deficits; we were projected to have \$300-billion-a-year deficits as far as the eye can see. Now we're going to have a balanced budget sometime in the next year, and it's projected we'll have a trillion dollars in surpluses over the next decade—more than enough money if we do some other things

to fix the Social Security system for the younger people listening here today. But I want to say again, no matter what we do to Social Security, those of you who are 16, 17, 20, and 21, I know it's hard to think about the end of your life, your later years, when you're that age, but you will have to do more, through your employer, through your own individual efforts, to save for your own retirement over and above Social Security if you want to maintain your standard of living when you retire.

Now, Mr. Kolbe asked a couple of questions about raising the retirement age, and then Mr. Weller asked about specific plans. Let me say, I don't want to dodge any of that, but I think all those proposals should be out there on the table. And I think that the most important thing now is, if I advocate a specific plan right now, then all the debate will be about that. The first thing we've got to do is to get the American people solidly lined up behind change. Let's stick with these basic principles I've outlined, and I want to encourage other people to come forward with their ideas. In December we'll all sit down, come up with our—we'll all put our various ideas on the table, and we'll begin hammering out a plan that we can present in January.

I still hear some new ideas almost every week coming from Democratic and Republican Members of Congress and private citizens that I think should be aired. If I put a specific plan on the table now, it will undermine and weaken debate, not strengthen it.

I do agree with those of you who say it ought to be possible for us to save Social Security without a payroll tax increase. I don't think we ought to automatically rule out any ideas over the next 30 to 50 years, as some would do, but I think that we plainly know that we can do this and provide for increased strength of the system without a payroll tax increase, given current assumptions. So I believe that will be possible.

Now, let me just answer one last question. You asked about raiding the Social Security Fund. Let me say that that just depends on how you look at it. The Social Security Trust Fund is basically a guarantee that certain obligations will be paid out to retirees, includ-

ing the COLA, as well as to the disabled, and to those who are the survivors who are eligible to be paid under it.

Now, in 1983, when the Social Security reforms were passed, it is true that the Government was collecting more in Social Security taxes than were needed in any given year to pay for that. So rather than raise other taxes to pay for other governmental expenses, the rest of the Government borrowed and gave a bond to the Social Security Trust Fund, with the full faith and credit of the United States behind it, a legal obligation to pay back the money with interest to the Social Security Trust Fund when it was needed to pay out. And so there is no reason to believe that all the money that's been taken out since 1983 will not be paid back in as soon as it's needed to meet the legal obligations of the Social Security Trust Fund.

By doing that, by borrowing that money and paying it back, we didn't do anything to affect the obligations of the Fund to pay Social Security recipients in the future. But we did keep the Government from borrowing more money out in the private sector, competing with the private sector for money, and running interest rates up. So I think on balance it's been a safe and sound thing to do, and I do not believe that the raid has occurred on the Social Security Trust Fund. It would be a raid if the money were not paid back when it's due to be paid to you, but the money will be paid back when it's due to be paid to you.

And that's one of the things that we have to make sure is never interfered with, the legal obligation of the United States Government to replenish that Trust Fund and pay back the money when it's needed for the recipients.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:20 p.m. by satellite from Room 5 at Penn Valley Community College to five local forums located in Columbia, MD, New Britain, CT, Philadelphia, PA, Sierra Vista, AZ, and South Holland, IL. In his remarks, he referred to Commissioner of Social Security Kenneth Apfel.

## Remarks in a Panel Discussion at the National Forum on Social Security in Kansas City

April 7, 1998

[Moderator Gwen Ifill, NBC News, introduced the panel participants and asked the President if proposals to privatize Social Security were a slippery slope or a cure.]

**The President.** Well, I don't think it's necessarily a slippery slope. I think the issue is, if you start with certain basic principles and you start with certain basic facts, then I think there are any number of options that can be chosen that both fit the facts—because if you start—you get in trouble in life if you start denying the facts. The facts are what we talked about this morning, the population trends, the financial problems of the system. I think it's important to keep a system that's universal, that's fair, that has a benefit certain as a baseline, and that deals with the problems of the disabled and the low income people that are presently helped.

If you do all that, could you construct some system which also made allowance for private accounts? I think you could, yes. But could you—would I favor totally privatizing the system? No, because then you couldn't have a universal system that was fair that had a benefit certain.

Let me just back up and say, people are always saying, "Well, so what's your plan?" And what I'm attempting to do here is to avoid announcing a plan while we go through this period first of educating the whole electorate, all of our citizens, on what the facts are, and then eliciting ideas from people to get the broadest range of ideas. Because if I come out and say, "Well, here's exactly what I think ought to be done," then that forecloses debate when I'm trying to broaden debate. I want all of you to have your say, and I want us to wind up getting the best possible ideas.

But I think the important thing that you need to know about me and my position is, what are the principles I intend to follow, and are we prepared to do this? And I think I've answered those questions today.

But I think it would be a real mistake to rule out—what I think we all would like to

see—let me go back to what Senator Santorum said in his opening remarks about the problems with the rate of return and what Senator Kerrey said in his opening remarks about the need to give all people some wealth-generating capacity. I think we'd all like to see a higher rate of return on the system, on the investments. The question is, how do you get that and still keep the system that has lifted so many seniors out of poverty and dealt with disability and dealt with premature death and dealt with all the other problems the Social Security system deals with? But I think there are lots of options to do that.

[Panelist Senator J. Robert Kerrey described features of the reform proposal he and Senator Daniel Moynihan have presented. A participant suggested removing the welfare aspects from Social Security and keeping any increase in contributions under the private control of the individual. Panelists responded that simply raising taxes to keep the current system operating would not be politically feasible and that comprehensive reforms to stabilize the system are necessary.]

**The President.** Let me just say, I don't know anybody who has proposed—and I think your Missouri Congressman today made this point, or one of the Members who spoke before me or after me made this point—I don't know anybody who thinks that we should try to preserve the status quo program with an increase in the payroll tax. Most Americans are paying more in payroll tax than they are in income tax today—most working families are. And I don't know anybody who favors that.

And with the projected surpluses we have now, all of the proposed solutions that I have seen so far I believe are achievable with no increase in the payroll tax. So that goes back to what you said.

There are some people who believe that there maybe ought to be an increase of, let's say, one percent, but only for private savings accounts, totally within the control of the payer. So it would be, in effect, an enforced savings plan to give you some investment in private income later on in life, that there are some proposals.

The only thing I've said about taxes is, I think that we ought to admit that we can solve this problem without an increase in the payroll tax, but we ought not to put ourselves in the position of saying that we won't even listen to somebody who's got a different idea. For example, I think the Kerrey-Moynihan plan—Senator Kerrey just left—has a fairly steep cut in the payroll tax in the first 20 or 30 years or something like that, and then, because of projected demographics, actually has it creeping up again—because we try to have 75-year plans with Social Security—actually has it creeping up again in 30, 35 years, something like that.

But I don't think you have to worry—most of us, I believe, are committed to trying to find a way to solve this problem that doesn't involve an increase in the payroll tax. And if there were any, all of the plans I've seen are those that say that this should be a savings account that's yours to invest as you see fit.

*[A participant asked why the President had not actively supported legislation to prohibit any further borrowing from Social Security funds.]*

**The President.** Because I'm against it. I haven't taken a position to get it achieved because I think it would be a big mistake. The Social Security Fund has been investing in Government securities, which have the full faith and credit of the Government behind it. The Government then takes that money and spends it on other things; that's true. But it's an investment by the Social Security Trust Fund. If they take in more money in any given year than they give out as benefits, they have to do something with that money. They have to invest it somehow. If they invest it in Government securities, they get the money back plus interest, and it's the safest possible investment.

Now, there was a lot of talk for years about how this amounted to a raid on the Social Security Trust Fund. And I could understand that talk because we were running huge deficits every year, so people had a right to ask, what's going to happen when the Government has to pay back the Social Security Trust Fund and the Trust Fund needs the money to pay out benefits—which is one reason it was so imperative that we balance the

budget and then start running a surplus. But now the projected surpluses we have over the next 10 to 20 years are surpluses over and above what it will take to pay back to the Social Security Trust Fund the money of their investment plus interest.

And I believe it was a good investment by the Social Security Trust Fund. I also think it was good for the taxpayers at large. It kept the Government from going out into the private markets, borrowing money, running interest rates up, and driving your interest rates up by making it harder for you to get money. So I don't agree that it was a bad policy. But it would have become a horrible policy if we hadn't balanced the budget and started running a surplus, because then when it came time for the Government to pay back the Social Security Trust Fund, we either wouldn't have been able to pay the money back or we would have had to sock you with a huge tax increase. But you don't have to worry about that now because we've got this deficit down, we're going to run a surplus, and it's going to look like a good investment of the Trust Fund, I think.

*[Panelist Representative Kenny C. Hulshof stated that there were proposals in Congress to make Social Security surpluses untouchable to counteract the tendency to create new programs with available money.]*

**The President.** If I could just follow up, because he made a point there that I think deserves some greater attention. I didn't mean to dismiss your question as lightly as it may have sounded like. There are people who believe that it would be better—let's assume that what I said is right. It is right now, as long as we keep the balanced budget, we run the surplus. Let's assume that's right. Still there are people who say, "Okay, Mr. President, so the Social Security Trust Fund had a surplus, and they invested their surplus in Government securities, and they'll get it back plus interest. But wouldn't it be better, if we had any surplus, that in effect the surplus was invested in a way that went to the individual in accumulating benefits of the people who were paying the taxes?" That's basically what a lot of people say.

See, one reason the return is not any higher than it is, is that 90 percent of your taxes,

when you pay Social Security every year, are going to pay for the current Social Security benefits of your parents and grandparents. And that's what Senator Kerrey was talking about. That's what a lot of the people—the individual account argument is. If you get money this year, even if it's just \$2—if all you get is a 5 percent return on it, if you keep it there for 50 years, pretty soon you're going to have a pretty good chunk of change. That's the argument for having something for children at birth.

But I just want to point out, it will not be all that easy to shift from a system where you take all the surplus of any given year and apply it to each individual's future retirement when 90 percent of the money you're paying out now is being used to pay your parents' and grandparents' retirement. So it sounds like a good idea, but it's going to be hard to make the transition.

*[A participant asked the President to encourage more local discussion forums to explain the details of the Social Security crisis. Panelist Senator Rick Santorum agreed on the need to lay a foundation of public understanding before Congress can act.]*

**The President.** Let me just say, if I could follow up on that, one of the most important things about a democracy, a representative democracy like ours, is that the political system—when you quoted President Ford today, it was a great comment—the political system act when it's required to act, in a bold way, but that you have the trust of the people and the support of the people. And this is an interesting issue. This is a fairly complex issue.

Now, I think the people have been ahead of the politicians as a whole in the sense that I think it's widely understood that there's a problem here, and therefore all of you want us to do something about it.

On the other hand, there is a fairly small number of the political leaders in Congress, let's say, and there's a fairly significant number of people in the press, the people that are covering this, who've been thinking about this problem for a long time, and they know we need to do something about it. So all of us who are activists, you know, the tendency is that we want to go in a room now and

just—you know there's a problem, so we'll fix out what to do about it.

The nearest thing I can think of that we're trying to avoid happened a few years ago, before I became President, on catastrophic health insurance. I don't know if you remember this—and the AARP even got burned on this—where everybody in the country knew there was a problem, right? So the politicians figured, "Well, the people all know there's a problem. The AARP says there's a problem. So we'll all sit down and do what seems like a reasonable thing and come up with a solution." And the public outcry was so great that a then-Democratic Congress and a Republican President had to undo what was done.

Now, it was too bad, really, in that, but it wasn't catastrophic for the country. This is big-time business. We can't—once we do this, we have to do it, do it right, and we can't undo it. We've got to do this right, and so that's why we're doing it in this way. And I thank you for what you said, and I'll do what I can to try to—I've got an office in Washington, part of the White House, that deals with State and local officials. We'll work with the Congress and try to see how we can multiply these things.

Thank you.

*[A participant asked how privatization would affect disability and survivor's insurance and how supporters could be certain that people would indeed save when given the opportunity.]*

**The President.** I think we should all have a chance at that. Go ahead. We'll start here; we'll just go around. You've asked, in some ways, the question on which everything else depends, so I'll give everybody a shot at that. Why don't you start?

*[Panelists commented on the need for Social Security to continue to protect the most vulnerable citizens, incorporating elements of privatization while continuing to provide an income guarantee.]*

**The President.** I can't add much to what's been said, except I would like—this is the one and only time I'll try to do this because the Social Security issue itself is sufficiently complex and important—but just for a moment, since you talked about families that are

at risk of having something bad happen, I'd like to fold the Social Security issue into the larger issue of family savings, just for a moment, and ask you to think about it and think about it from the point of view of a family living on, let's say, \$20,000 a year and one living on \$40,000 a year and then one living on \$100,000 a year.

We want a system, first, in Social Security that has some sort of a disability benefit and a survivor benefit to give a baseline threshold of existence to people that could have horrible misfortune. Then we want a baseline predictable retirement benefit that is universal, again, that—today it's lifting 15 million seniors out of poverty.

But there are other things that we want to happen in the course of a family's life. We want more and more people to be able to save for their own retirement. And keep in mind, more and more companies are offering their employees defined contribution plans, not defined benefit plans. There are very few—increasingly, a smaller percentage of our workforce works for a company that can afford to guarantee your retirement—that says, here's what your benefits are going to be forever.

So what have we done? We've tried to stabilize any retirement systems that are under water or at risk, with various actions in Washington. And the Congress, in a complete bipartisan fashion, has tried to dramatically increase the ease with which and the incentives through which people have to take out 401(k) plans and then can carry them from job to job.

In addition to that, in the IRA proposals that we passed in the last year as a part of the Balanced Budget Act—and then again last year we liberalized them, I think, some—you can now save for an IRA. And you can say, well, you can't afford to save. But if you can, you don't have to pay taxes on that money. And then later, if you withdraw now from an IRA, for example, to pay for your child's education expenses, you don't have to pay taxes on that either.

So what we're trying to do slowly but surely is to create a system in which middle class people who are strapped for cash can afford to save in a comprehensive way. Now, what are the problems? Relatively low rate of re-

turn on Social Security. And if you move away from low rate of return to higher rate of return, can you continue to maintain the baseline benefit and the universality, number one? Number two, do you create so much risk that if people happen to retire and need the money when there's a big drop in the stock market, they're in bad shape? Senator Santorum has really thought a lot about how to minimize the downside risk.

But I hear your message; I agree with it. And I think those are the real dilemmas we're going to have to figure out: What are people going to have to do for themselves outside the Social Security system, and what can we do to help them do that? How are we going to increase the return; how are we going to minimize the risk; how can we do that and keep the benefit level at an acceptable level?

But to me, what I'd like to do when I leave office when the 21st century starts, I'd like to know that any family that's out there with one person or two people that are working their hearts out, doing the best they can, no matter how meager their income, they're going to have a chance to create a little something for their children and themselves later on and have a chance to do even better, and that no 20-year-old person will ever have to worry about whether his or her Social Security taxes are going to be wasted, because there will be a retirement system when they retire.

*[A participant suggested removing the cap on the amount of wages subject to Social Security tax, as a means of generating more revenue for the system. A panelist responded that it would not generate enough additional revenue and would increase the tax burden unfairly.]*

**The President.** Maybe I should answer this since this is really a question, if we're going to defend this, that a Democrat should answer, if we're going to try to keep this non-political.

If you think about it, there may be an argument for raising the income some, because of inflation and because a lot more people have moved into higher income brackets in the last 5 years. But if you think about it—let's suppose you took it off altogether. You say, "What do I care about some baseball

player making \$10 million a year," right? But if you think about it, what would happen is you would be putting people in a position of paying over the course of their lifetimes 50, 60, 100 times more than they would ever draw out of the Social Security system. And you can say, "Well, they owe it to society." But these people also pay higher income taxes, and the rates are still pretty progressive for people in very high rates.

So I think you can make—in fact, if you took it off altogether—the gap that will exist in 2029 is the equivalent of about 2¼ percent of payroll, and that would close, I think, if you took it off altogether—I think about a percent and a half of payroll. But you would really have tremendously changed the whole Social Security system. You would have basically said, "If you get to where you make \$70,000 or more a year, we're going to soak you, and you're never going to get anything out of this compared to what you're putting in."

Like I said, I wouldn't rule out raising it some, but I think we should be very careful before we get out of the idea that this is something that we do together as a nation and there at least is some correlation between what we put in and what we get out, except we want people on the bottom to get out a whole lot more than they put in so we can give them a decent retirement. It goes back to what our nurse said there.

*[A participant asked if Congress would consider such unpopular options as raising the retirement age or changing the cost-of-living adjustment formula. Panelists responded that those options would be considered in the context of overall reform but should not be seen as a quick fix to a difficult problem.]*

**The President.** Let me just make one suggestion here, if I might, for all of you, and I'm embarrassed that I can't remember exactly the numbers for the question that the lady just asked. But you need to keep in mind, if the specifics are real important to you—I mean all the specifics—then I think you need to always know what the impact of any specific proposal is. So again I'll say, in the year 2029, we'll stop being in balance, and then we'll go into a deficit of roughly where we can only pay 75 percent of the cost

of the existing system of Social Security with the revenues that we have.

So if somebody says to you, "Well, what if we raise the retirement age to 70," or "What if we cut the cost of living by half a percent," or "What if we took the ceiling off the incomes earnings," to go back to this gentleman, I think it's important, if you really want to seriously discuss that level of detail, that you know what the impact of each specific one would be. And we can get you that information. For example—or if you want one percent of payroll devoted to individual savings account, what will that add to the gap of 2.23 percent in the short run. And then you just have to decide what you're prepared to do to close the gap.

But you have to understand, your Members of Congress here, they're going to have to actually make difficult decisions at something less than an abstract level. They're going to have to sit down and say, "Okay, if I raise the payroll ceiling this much, it will close four-tenths of a percent of this 2¼ percent payroll gap."

And one of the things that surprised me—the reason I brought this up—one of the things that surprised me when I started studying it in this way is what a small impact it would have to accelerate the rate at which we're going to 67 for the retirement age. I mean, it does you some good, but it doesn't have anything like the impact that I had imagined it would.

Do you want to say anything?

*[A panelist concurred, emphasizing that a reform package must balance many elements. A participant then described features of his retirement annuity.]*

**The President.** You like the fact that it's locked in?

**Q.** Yes, and I can't touch it. I can't cash in. I can't go buy shoes or anything like that. It's locked in for me. *[Laughter]*

**The President.** Thank you.

*[Panelists and participants commented on the options of individual savings accounts and 401(k) plans in terms of the level of access permitted and the need to preserve funds for use in retirement.]*

**The President.** But I do want to emphasize that your proposal would be not to increase the amount of payroll tax but to take a percent away so——

**Senator Santorum.** No. Take a percentage away so it wouldn't be an increased tax burden on you.

**The President.** Let me say to the young lady that asked this question, we changed the law on IRA's, individual retirement accounts—which would require you to be able to be able to put away something over and above your Social Security tax. But now, if you put money into an IRA now, and you have to withdraw from that IRA to meet a medical emergency or for a first-time home or to pay for education, you can do that without a penalty now. And if you do it for education, you do it without even paying any tax at all on the gain.

So there is a way under the present system, as a young person, that you can save. And if you face a medical emergency, you could withdraw from the savings without penalty, but it would have to be over and above what you pay in your payroll tax. And that wouldn't be changed by what Senator Santorum—he wouldn't make it any harder for you to do that. And we tried to make it easier, in the way we changed the law in the last 2 years.

[A participant suggested changing the Social Security cap.]

**The President.** You think that there should be a cap on the size of your tax or that we should have a higher floor on the benefits?

[The participant said that those with incomes under \$30,000 per year should pay minimal or no Social Security tax. Senator Santorum responded that the present earned-income tax credit was intended to assist lower income taxpayers.]

**The President.** \$31,000.

**Senator Santorum.** It's up to around \$30,000—and you would get some credit to help you pay your Social Security tax. So in a sense—I do know that people earning under, I think it's \$20,000, pay no Social Security tax, net, of the EIC. So there is no Social Security tax burden, net, when you take the tax credit in effect.

**The President.** Let me say again, I believe that those of us who have higher incomes should pay more, on the Social Security cap. I don't have a problem with that. The only point I was making is, if you took the cap off altogether on upper income people, they literally—they wouldn't be in a Social Security system anymore, they'd just be writing 6 percent of their income for something that they'd never see.

And we do tax them more on the income tax side, considerably more. And we also have no cap on what they pay into the Medicare Trust Fund, which you pointed out. But the thing that has made Social Security work in the past is that everybody has had to pay in and everybody got to draw out, that there was a guarantee and a mutuality of responsibility.

The earned-income tax credit has been somewhat controversial in Congress, but if it were up to me, I would have it even more generous. Because the way it works now is the average family of four with an income of \$30,000 a year or less is paying approximately \$1,000 less in income tax, including eligibility for refunds, than they would have paid if the law hadn't been changed in 1993. And we did it to try to take account of the fact that the payroll tax was so high for people and that incomes of people—the lower 20 percent of our work force—had not gone up very much in the last 10 years.

But it seems to me that it's better to have some giveback there and still have a universal participation in the system, since we want everybody to be a part of both the responsibility for paying in and then be able to get the minimum amount coming out.

[A participant asked for assurance that anything would actually be done, citing the stalemate in campaign finance reform, and panelists responded that Congress was working to achieve a bipartisan solution and expected to act on Social Security reform in 1999. Ms. Ifill then asked for the President's closing comments.]

**The President.** Well, that question melds rather nicely with the last question that was asked from the audience. I deeply regret that we haven't passed campaign finance reform



legislation. But to answer this, why is this different, for one thing, the divisions in the campaign finance reform are both not only divisions—they're divisions of party and also divisions of incumbency and non-incumbency. And then they're honest differences of opinion about what would work and wouldn't—all kinds of problems—and complicated by Supreme Court decisions and a zillion other things.

But the other thing is, frankly, every Member of Congress that really doesn't want to pass it knows that the Republic will go on and that the system we have is capable of producing significant positive change; witness the Balanced Budget Act and the fact that we've had the biggest increase in aid to higher education in 50 years and the biggest increase in coverage of children's health insurance in 35 years. So people know that this system can be made to function.

The Members of Congress in both parties know that at some point in the future Social Security will stop functioning, with grievous consequences to the fabric of American life that affect people who are Republicans and Democrats and independents, in all walks of life, with all manner of circumstances. And basically, there's enough patriotism in the Congress to want to address it. That's the honest truth. It's an issue of our survival as a people, our unity as a people, and the innate patriotism of the people that are serving. That's why I believe it will happen.

What I think will happen, what I want to see is that we will spend the time between now and December trying to answer the question this gentleman had: How can we get out this information to people? We also want you to become more familiar, so you can answer questions for yourselves. If you had to choose, for example, between a faster movement to a higher retirement age or an individual savings account or, you know, raising the cap on income or all these choices they're going to have to make, what choices would you make and why? And how would you answer the other charges? This ought to be a big national debate. There is no other program that affects so many of you in such an intimate, personal way.

And then what I believe will happen is all these Members will have lots of forums in

their own States. They'll listen to their own people. They'll listen to these experts. You're going to see 100 or more articles written by people like our panelists here, coming up with new refinements on ideas, analyzing the proposals that Senator Kerrey and others have made.

And then in December, in January, we'll sit down and come up with the best possible solution. It won't please everybody 100 percent, but it will save Social Security for the 21st century, and it will make us a stronger, more united country. And then I think the Congress will come in and pass it because it is the right thing to do.

That may seem naive, and I may be old-fashioned, but I'm more idealistic today than I was the day that I took the Oath of Office. That's what I think will happen. And I think you will make it possible, because you'll support people like these folks who will do the right thing by your children and your future.

Thank you.

NOTE: The discussion began at 2:16 p.m. at the Penn Valley Community College. The panel included Senators J. Robert Kerrey and Rick Santorum; Representatives Kenny C. Hulshof and Earl Pomeroy; Marilyn Moon, senior fellow, Urban Institute; Gary Burtless, senior fellow, economic studies, Brookings Institute; David Walker, trustee, Social Security and Medicare Trust Fund; and Fred Goldberg, former executive director, Commission on Social Security and Entitlements.

### **Statement on the Death of Tammy Wynette**

*April 7, 1998*

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the untimely death of Tammy Wynette. For more than 30 years, Tammy Wynette defined the Nashville sound that helped to make American country western music popular all over the world. Her string of number one hits has<sup>1</sup> filled music halls, homes, and radio waves—and her trademark style has<sup>1</sup> filled our hearts and made her a legend. From the Mississippi cotton fields where she worked as a child, to the stage of the Grand Ole Opry where she presided as the First Lady of Country Music, Tammy

<sup>1</sup> White House correction.

Wynette was an American original, and we will miss her.

**Executive Order 13079—Waiver Under the Trade Act of 1974 With Respect to Vietnam**

*April 7, 1998*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 402(c)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("Act") (19 U.S.C. 2432(c)(2)), which continues to apply to Vietnam pursuant to section 402(d) of the Act, and having made the report to the Congress required by section 402(c)(2) of the Act, I hereby waive the application of sections 402(a) and 402(b) of the Act with respect to Vietnam.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
April 7, 1998.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., April 8, 1998]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on April 9.

**Proclamation 7078—Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A., 1998**

*April 7, 1998*

*By the President of the United States of America*

**A Proclamation**

As a new century of great promise and possibility approaches, as science and technology advance at astonishing rates, it is clear that now, more than ever, education is the key to our children's future.

We should also recognize that education must serve not only as a path to knowledge, but also as a means to develop the character of our Nation's youth. When expanding educational opportunities, we must ensure that in addition to raising academic standards, we emphasize values, personal responsibility, and community spirit.

A firm believer in nurturing both mind and heart, the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi

Menachem M. Schneerson, devoted his life to helping young people realize their potential and become visionary leaders and thinkers, as well as concerned, caring, and productive citizens. He established more than 2,000 educational and social institutions in more than 40 States and nearly 60 countries. He was deeply committed to fostering civic pride and moral integrity along with professional success.

On this day, as we remember Rabbi Schneerson's achievements, let us reaffirm our commitment to providing our Nation's children with an education that will enable them to flourish, both intellectually and spiritually.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton**, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 7, 1998, as Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A. I invite Government officials, educators, volunteers, and all of the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate activities, programs, and ceremonies.

**In Witness Whereof**, I have hereunto set my hand this seventh day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-second.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., April 8, 1998]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 9.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders on Most-Favored-Nation Status for Vietnam**

*April 7, 1998*

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*

Pursuant to subsection 402(c)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, (hereinafter the "Act"), I have issued an Executive order waiving the application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act with respect to Vietnam.

I wish to report to the Congress that I have determined that the requirements of subsections 402(c)(2)(A) and (B) of the Act have been satisfied.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

### **Message on the Observance of Passover, 1998**

*April 7, 1998*

Warmest greetings to all those celebrating Passover.

This sacred holiday commemorates the long and arduous exodus of the Jewish people to the promised land of Israel. Despite centuries of slavery and oppression, the Israelites, strengthened by the promise of salvation, refused to abandon their dreams of freedom. In their darkest moments of persecution, the hope of liberation and redemption burned bright in their hearts, lighting their way to a new land and a new life.

Passover holds special meaning for us this year as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the creation of the modern state of Israel. It is a powerful reminder of the indomitable spirit of the Jewish people, of the quest for freedom and dignity that unites us all, of God's powerful presence in our history, and God's constant loving concern in our lives.

As the Jewish community across America and around the world commemorates this holy season, let us pray together for peace in the land of Israel, for the tranquility of its people, and for a bright and hopeful future for us all.

Hillary joins me in extending best wishes for a memorable Passover.

**Bill Clinton**

NOTE: This message was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 7.

### **Remarks at a Democratic Business Council Dinner in Chicago, Illinois**

*April 7, 1998*

Thank you very, very much. Let me thank all of you for coming tonight, and especially to Lou and Ruth for opening their home and giving us this wonderful meal, and Ramsey Lewis and the other fine musicians. You get a comedian after me. [*Laughter*] I used to tell jokes and I was pretty good at it and they made me stop. They said it wasn't Presidential, so now I have to have help.

I want to thank Mike and Pat Cherry and Howard and Judy Tullman and anyone else who was responsible for this dinner tonight. On behalf of Steve Grossman and Len Barrack, we're very grateful for the help and support you're giving to our party.

I think I saw Congressman Conyers walk in here a minute ago; there he is. Thank you, John, for being here. I want to thank Gary LaPaille, who is leaving his post after many years as chairman of the Democratic Party of Illinois, for his work in that regard. Thank you, Gary.

I want to say a word—I thought that when Dick Durbin got wound up a while ago we were about 3 days from election day. [*Laughter*] That speech had the kind of juice you expect when you're coming right down to the wire. I want to thank Senator Durbin for many things. He has been a great friend to me, to our administration, and to this country. I was thrilled when he was elected, and I have been even more pleased by his service. He has exceeded even my high expectations, and you should be very, very proud of him. He has done a great job for you.

I want to say a little more about Carol Moseley-Braun in a moment, but I was very delighted to see not only what Dick Durbin said but the reception that you gave for her. I hope very much that she will be re-elected. I intend to do everything I can to help her get re-elected. And I think that for her advocacy of education reform alone she has earned the right to be re-elected United States Senator from Illinois.

I'd also like to say a word for someone who's not here, our nominee for Governor,

Glenn Poshard, who's been a great Congressman from southern Illinois. And I've had a chance to work with him now for over 5 years. I like him very much. He is an extremely able political leader, and he has—when Dick and Carol and I were riding in here together from the airport, we were laughing about Glenn Poshard's fanatic support he got in the Democratic primary. He got 98 percent of the vote in his hometown, and I think that's a pretty good indication of what the people who know him best think. So the way I've got it figured, if the rest of us could help the rest of Illinois know him as well, he'll do quite well in the fall.

I was thinking when all this storm came up, when the tent began to sway, this is the way I live every day in Washington. [*Laughter*] Believe me, I've found that if you just keep standing up, most of the time the tent won't fall. [*Laughter*] And if the storm blows over you, you won't melt. Ninety percent of it is just showing up every day. It gratifies your friends and confounds your enemies; it's a good thing to do. [*Laughter*]

I wanted to say to all of you, I just came back from this incredible trip to Africa, and I won't give you a travelog. If you followed it in the press, you know pretty much what we did. But let me say it was, for me, not only as your President but as a citizen, it was an astonishing experience. Hillary went to Africa with Chelsea about almost exactly a year ago, and they went to many of the same places that I went, although not all. And they had many of the same experiences I did, although not all, but I was sort of prepared for this at one level.

But I was literally overwhelmed by the energy of the place and the refusal of people to be ground down by the most difficult of circumstances. I guess the most emotional moments of the trip were when I flew into Rwanda to meet with six survivors of the genocide, which took somewhere between 700,000 and a million lives in 90 days. And I met a woman there, among other—I met this woman who was calmly telling me—she wore her nicest dress—and she was there with all great dignity, incredible dignity, telling me how the Hutus had come to her village to kill her people and that they had taken

her outside with her family and taken a machete to her.

And miraculously, she hadn't died. But when she woke up lying on the ground in her village, she saw that her husband and her six children had been killed. And yet somehow she felt the—she found the inner strength to go on and to devote her life to trying to heal these terrible wounds.

I met a very articulate young woman who lost two of her four siblings and both her parents in the war, and she talked about how her parents were betrayed by their neighbors. These are stories that a lot of Jewish-Americans can identify with. But this woman was telling me—she said, “You know, we lived in this little village.” And she said, “My parents—their neighbor came up to them and said, ‘These people will take you to safety.’ And instead they took them to a stadium where they were killed with other people just like them.” And she said, “Now I have to go back to their house, and we have the same neighbor we had before.”

And they're trying to come to grips with this and trying to decide whether there is anything they could do like what's been done under President Mandela's leadership in South Africa to try to work through this some way and build some harmony.

I saw a village in Senegal where people were living as they had lived for hundreds of years, and they were living on the edge of a desert, but they had recovered 5 acres of land in beautiful green gardens because an organization in the United States and our aid program had given them enough money to dig a well. All they needed was enough money to dig a well. They've recovered 5 acres against the desert. It's a big problem in Africa and a big international environmental problem, the growth of the desert. And these people were so proud of what they had done, and this village elder was just holding his accounts in his hand. He wanted me to know that they hadn't wasted the money that had been given them and he was keeping count of all their expenses and all their income, and he knew exactly what their return on the investment he'd been given had been in this distant village in Senegal.

When I was in Accra, Ghana—you probably saw the film, which was somewhat misleading—we had something like 400,000 people within this square and a couple hundred thousand beyond the square, and I was upset because two ladies got crushed against the fence as the crowd came forward, and we got them out, and they were fine later. But I guess I want to tell you two things about that. When I came home, besides being more optimistic about Africa than I had ever been before and more optimistic about our options for investment in Africa, we dedicated a commerce center in Johannesburg, dedicated to the late Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown. We had a lot of African business people there, a lot of American business people there. And last year American business people earned a 30 percent return on their investment in Africa, highest return of investment on any continent, so I'm quite optimistic about all of that.

But the two points I want to make tonight—I came home thinking, for all of the challenges we have in this country, we are so lucky to live in a country where we have the level of prosperity we enjoy and where we're at least trying to make a conscious effort to live together across all the racial and ethnic and religious lines that divide us. And the second thing that I want to say to you is, I just wish every American could see in the reaction that Hillary and I received in Africa, the way people all across the world in distant villages, many of them we've never done anything for, the way they look at the United States, the way they believe in the promise of America.

And what I want to say to you tonight is I spent a lot of time in my first term trying to fix things that weren't working in America, and a lot of it was quite controversial. Dick Durbin told the truth: Carol Moseley-Braun, a first-term Senator from Illinois, with all the Republicans saying that they would destroy anybody that voted for my economic plan in 1993, that it would cause a huge recession and be the end of the world, if she hadn't been willing to walk down the aisle and say "Aye," I wouldn't be here today, because the economic plan we passed was the thing that got the deficit down, which got the interest rates down, which got the investment going,

which has put us in the position now for the first time in 30 years of having a balanced budget and projected surpluses of a trillion dollars over the next decade.

The point I want to make is not that we're doing well. The point I want to make is the point I tried to make in the State of the Union Address. This is a golden moment for our country. We have the best economy in a generation. We've got the crime rate going down for 5 years in a row, apparently for the first time since the Eisenhower administration. We've got a record high homeownership. We have the lowest welfare rolls in 27 years.

But this is a time when we should not be complacent, because the world is still changing very rapidly and because there are still a lot of challenges in this country. And when I see how others look at us and I imagine the challenges we have at home and the opportunities and what I see going on in the rest of the world, this is a time when we ought to say, "We have the elbow room now. We have the confidence and, frankly, we have some money, to bear down and meet the challenges this country is going to face, so that we can position America to guarantee that 50 years from now people will still feel the same way about our country that they do today, that I saw in Africa." That is really what we ought to be doing.

I'll just give you a few examples. Today I was in Kansas City with two Republican Members of Congress and two Democratic Members of Congress having a national forum on Social Security. Why? Because when all the baby boomers get in the Social Security system, there will only be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security if we keep the same birth rates, immigration rates, and retirement rates we have today. And that means the system will go broke in 2029—at least, we'll only be covering 75 percent of the cost of the system with the revenues that are coming in.

And I think it's imperative now to do something about that, because we can do something now, 30 years in advance, that will guarantee that those of us in the baby boom generation don't either have to see our poorest members in a destitute old age or see our children overtaxed and impaired in their

ability to raise our grandchildren just because we didn't take the time right now to fix Social Security. And we ought to do it, and we ought to do it right now.

So we're going to have all these forums around the country. And then in December I'm going to convene a meeting of the leadership, and in January we're going to try to pass some legislation. Why? Because that's a gift we can give the 21st century. It's a gift. Just think, nobody else will have to worry about that for 30 or 40 years. And it's something we ought to do to just free people of worrying that either we're going to go back to an insecure old age for some of our fellow Americans, or we're going to damage the American economy or burden younger people coming up.

I'll give you another example. We have a historic opportunity this year—I know it's an election year, and it's hard to get stuff done. We've got an historic opportunity to pass comprehensive legislation to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco. Now, 3,000 kids start smoking cigarettes every day; 1,000 of them are going to have their lives shortened by it. It's illegal in every State in the country; yet it's still a terrible problem.

Dick Durbin has done as much as anybody in America to call the attention of the people of this country to this problem. And I thank him for that. But it will be unconscionable if, just because this is an election year and just because this is a complicated issue, we don't deal with it this year. And this is a long-term issue. You think about it. We've got a chance to save 1,000 lives a day in perpetuity, and we ought to do it.

In education—tomorrow morning, Carol Moseley-Braun and I are going to go out and do an event to highlight what she's trying to do to get us, for the first time, to help our schools either construct new buildings or rehabilitate the ones that are there.

Now, why is this a big deal? We've got the largest number of children in school ever now. The first time we've got more kids in school, starting last year, than the baby boom generation had, the first time—the largest number of kids in school. Now, the average age of a school building in the big inner cities of America is 60 years. In Philadelphia the average age of a school building is 65 years

of age. You have all these kids coming into bigger and bigger classes, bringing more and more problems from their home. I offered a program that would reduce class size in the early grades to an average of 18 kids a class, hire 100,000 teachers, and modernize schools. She gave me the idea on the schools. And this is a huge thing.

We're having a big fight in Washington because the leaders of the other party and most of the rank and file don't think it's the thing to do. They think it's not their problem; they think it's a local problem. But even though Chicago—I take my hat off to Chicago, and I'm trying to help other school districts do what's been done here to kind of end social promotion and have mandatory summer school, do the things that have been done here, which you should all be very proud of.

It is not true that it's not a national problem. We've got the finest system of higher education in the world. No one questions it. Today I'm down at a community college in Kansas City at this Social Security forum, meeting with a bunch of students from the University of Central Oklahoma who came all the way over to come to the forum, and I meet two kids from Pakistan, two kids from Nigeria, a young man from Darbyshire in England. Why? Because people want to come to America to go to college. We've got the best system of college education in the world.

So what I tried to do after I became President was just to open the doors of college to everybody with better student loans and more work-study slots and more scholarships and now a \$1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college and tax credits for the other years as well.

But no one believes we have the best system of elementary and secondary education in the world. And if you look ahead—right now we have the strongest economy in the world, but more and more and more and more this economy will run on what people know and not only what people know but what they're capable of learning. Therefore, we must do whatever we can to give ourselves the best system of elementary and secondary education in the world.

I tell you, I've been working at this for 20 years. And I would be very surprised if

any President has ever spent any more time in schools than I have, because I was a Governor for a dozen years before I took this office. I still read the literature. I still try to learn everything I can. No one has all the answers. But I can promise you this: Every problem in American education has been solved by somebody somewhere. And the biggest problem is we don't have a system where we have to learn from one another to survive.

But I can also tell you that I have been in districts in very poor areas, but I've never been in a successful school that wasn't in decent physical shape. And that's why what Carol Moseley-Braun wants to do is all right. I can also tell you there's no point in us hiring 100,000 teachers if they don't have a classroom. You can't lower the class size unless there is a classroom with a teacher to put the 18 kids in.

So this is a very big deal that we're trying to do. And again I say, in my judgment, while there is no simple answer, having higher standards, having greater accountability, doing more to get the best kind of teachers trained and out in the schools, and having the smaller classes in the early grades, and having the help to districts that don't have a lot of money to have decent physical facilities, these things are important. And her leadership in this agenda alone—never mind the fact that if you're from southern Illinois she's pretty good on the agricultural issues and all that—just on education, our stake in building a world-class system of elementary and secondary education dwarfs most other public issues, and it justifies your effort and support to re-elect Carol Moseley-Braun to the Senate.

Let me just mention a couple of other issues. When I was in Africa, I met—I had an amazing meeting with six environmentalists from countries around the African continent, and it was very interesting. Those of you who are interested in the environment, if you'd been sitting there talking to these people, you would have thought this was a conversation you could have in this community, except you wouldn't be worried about how to preserve the rhinos. I don't think there are any around here. But except for the—you know, the common interest we

have in having clean water and clean air and a sustainable environment is very important.

One of the things that I'm hoping we can do in this session of Congress—but I'm not optimistic based on the preliminary soundings—is to pass our clean water initiative and also to pass an initiative for America to do its part in dealing with the problem of global warming.

The overwhelming consensus of scientists is this climate is warming up. And if you see what's happening, you see how much more extreme weather this El Niño has brought us all over America than the last El Niño, and you look at how upsetting it's been, that will become more and more and more regular unless we take steps to reverse the incredible speed at which the Earth is warming up.

Now, our party is four square for the proposition that we can preserve the environment and grow the economy. But right now, we're in a big fight about that in Washington, and right now we're not doing so well.

So again I say to you, if you're thinking about not just how to keep this stock market up until next month but what kind of America our grandchildren are going to live in, whether we have a systematic program to have clean water in America and whether we're prepared to do something about climate change are huge issues. It is our moral responsibility in a good time to take on a long-term issue like this.

Now, I'll just mention two other things very briefly. First, a lot of you know that I've invested a good deal of time and effort in efforts to bring peace to other parts of the world. We're doing much better in Bosnia today than we were a year ago. And I still think we were right in 1985 to go in and stop that war. It was the bloodiest conflict in Europe since the end of World War II, and I think history will record that.

We are working very, very hard to find a formula which will permit the Middle East peace process to be resumed. And the less I say about it the better, but we're working hard on it.

And Senator Mitchell, my former Senate majority leader, was named to be the principal broker for peace in Ireland, and he's tabled a peace proposal, and there is some chance that sometime within the next few

days the land of my ancestors will actually have an agreement to resolve some issues that are hundreds of years old.

So there's a lot of hope there, but the United States should continue to be involved in this. And I hope all of you will support that. Believe it or not, it's more controversial than you think in Washington. There are lots of people that think we ought to just be tending to our knitting more and be less involved around the world. I personally believe we should be more involved around the world because there is no easy division between our domestic interest and our foreign interest. And about a third of our economic growth in the last 5 years has come because of our expansion of trade and our reaching out to other countries and our willingness to be good partners with other people.

The last point I would make is this: If you think about what the roots of the problems in the Middle East and Bosnia and Northern Ireland are; if you think about the fact that in Rwanda, where I told you somewhere between 700,000 and a million people were killed in 90 days because of the conflict between the Hutus and the Tutsis—tribal differences—let me tell you that they lived together in that country for hundreds of years, not hundreds of days—hundreds of years. Even though they are very distinct looking, the differences—you could see after you were in a room, you'd know who the Hutus were and who the Tutsis were. They spoke the same language. They had the same native religion. They shared the same land. They worked out accommodations for tribal differences. And yet still, the wheel ran off the track, and there they were, killing each other with breathtaking abandon.

What's the point of all of this? One of the reasons that America is attractive to others in the rest of the world is because we are trying every day to bridge the gaps that are still tearing people apart. What good does it do you to work a computer, to solve all the problems of science, if all you do is put all that knowledge and all that power to work in a primitive way dividing people instead of uniting them?

So I would say that I still believe we have no more important work than trying to bring the American people together and trying to

continue to be a beacon of hope. I was so moved when I was in Senegal, a country that is 85 percent Muslim. I went to the biggest mosque in the country and visited. Why? Because they publicly rebuke the notion that they should hold down people who are of a different faith. The President is a Muslim with a Christian wife and now a Jewish daughter-in-law. *[Laughter]*

And so, here's this man, every day, in much more difficult circumstances than America, trying to embody the idea that it is crazy for us to punish one another because of our religious or our racial or our tribal differences. But these are deep feelings, man. It is deep in the psychology of all human history that people, when threatened especially, look for others to look down on and try to define themselves up by pushing others down. And you have to teach people to escape that, and you have to practice that.

And every time people see America uniting all different kinds of people, it sends a loud message to the rest of the world and gives a greater chance that your children and your children's children will never have to leave our shores to fight in a foreign war because people hate each other for reasons that are fundamentally not as important as what they have in common.

So these are the things I think we ought to be thinking about. Now, if you think about what elections used to be about—what did they used to talk about, the Democrats? You didn't hear this; this is not the subject of elections. How did the Republicans win the Congress? How did they win the White House? They always said, "Oh, you can't vote for those guys. They're weak on the deficit. You know, they're weak on crime; they're weak on welfare; they're weak on all that." You remember all those speeches, sort of driving wedges in the election.

Well, I'm sorry, but there's no deficit anymore. We've got the lowest welfare rolls in 27 years. We've got the best economy in a generation. The crime rate has been going down. We just last week said we were going to stop importing another 55 assault weapons, keep another million and a half weapons out of this country that are designed for nothing other than killing people. So now we don't have to worry about that anymore.



Elections do not need to be, and indeed should not be, dominated by negative issues anymore or fear. There's no fear. You can go out in 1998 and talk to your friends and neighbors and try to put a little juice in the idea that we can actually have a referendum in America about the future direction of this country and about whether we're going to look at the long-term problems.

And I think if we do that, Carol Moseley-Braun will win handily. I think if we do that, our party will pick up seats in Congress, although it never happens in the second term of an incumbent President that his party picks up seats in Congress. It never happens. It's going to happen this time if we make the election about the future of the American people.

And your investment in our party has made the chance of that happening much, much more likely. That's why you're here, and that's why I'm grateful.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:17 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Lou and Ruth Weisbach; Mike and Pat Cherry and Howard and Judy Tullman, event co-chairs; and Steve Grossman, national chair, and Leonard Barrack, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee.

### **Executive Order 13080—American Heritage Rivers Initiative Advisory Committee**

*April 7, 1998*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App., as amended, it is hereby ordered as follows:

**Section 1. Establishment.** There is hereby established the American Heritage Rivers Initiative Advisory Committee ("Committee"). The Committee shall consist of up to 20 members appointed by the President from the public and private sectors. Each member of the Committee shall be a person who, as a result of his or her training, experience, and attainments, is well qualified to appraise the quality of nominations for selection of rivers as American Heritage Rivers submit-

ted by communities across the country. The expertise of members of the Committee shall be in areas such as natural, cultural, and historic resources; water quality; public health; scenic and recreation interests; tourism and economic development interests; industry; and agriculture. The President shall designate a Chair from among the members of the Committee.

**Sec. 2.** (a) The Committee shall review nominations from communities and recommend to the President up to 20 rivers for consideration for designation as American Heritage Rivers. From the rivers recommended for consideration, the President shall designate ten as American Heritage Rivers.

(b) In its review of nominations submitted by communities, the Committee shall provide its assessment of:

- (1) The scope of each nomination's application and the adequacy of its design to achieve the community's goals;
- (2) Whether the natural, economic (including agricultural), scenic, historic, cultural, and/or recreational resources featured in the application are distinctive or unique;
- (3) The extent to which the community's plan of action is clearly defined and the extent to which the plan addresses all three American Heritage Rivers objectives—natural resource and environmental protection, economic revitalization, and historic and cultural preservation—either through planned actions or past accomplishments, as well as any other characteristics of the proposals that distinguish a nomination, such as:
  - (A) Community vision and partnership;
  - (B) Sustainability of products and projects, including project maintenance;
  - (C) Resources, both committed and anticipated, including means of generating additional support from both private and public sources;
  - (D) Anticipated Federal role as defined by the applicants;
  - (E) Schedule or timeline;
  - (F) Citizen involvement;

- (G) Public education relating to the designation of the river;
  - (H) Logistical support, operating procedures, and policies;
  - (I) Prior accomplishments, if relevant, and relationship to existing plans and projects in the area; and
  - (J) Measures of performance.
- (4) The strength and diversity of support for the nomination and plan of action as evidenced by letters from local and State governments, Indian tribes, elected officials, any and all parties who participate in the life and health of the area to be nominated, or who have an interest in the economic life and cultural and environmental vigor of the involved community.
- (c) The Committee also should seek to recommend the selection of rivers that as a group:
- (1) Represent the natural, historic, cultural, social, economic, and agricultural diversity of American rivers;
  - (2) Showcase a variety of stream sizes and an assortment of urban, rural, and mixed settings from around the country, including both relatively pristine and degraded rivers;
  - (3) Highlight a variety of innovative programs in such areas as historic preservation, sustainable development through tourism, wildlife management, fisheries restoration, recreation, community revitalization, agricultural practices, and flood plain and watershed management;
  - (4) Include community efforts in early stages of development as well as those that are more well established; and
  - (5) Stand to benefit from targeted Federal assistance.
- (d) The Committee shall report its recommendations for selection of rivers as American Heritage Rivers to the President through the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality.

**Sec. 3. Administration.** (a) The heads of executive departments and agencies shall provide the Committee, to the extent practicable and permitted by law, such information with respect to river revitalization as the Committee requires to fulfill its functions.

(b) The Committee shall be supported both administratively and financially by the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

**Sec. 4. General.** The Committee shall terminate no later than 2 years from the date of this order. The Chair of the Committee, with the approval of the designated Federal officer, shall call meetings of the American Heritage Rivers Initiative Advisory Committee.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
April 7, 1998.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., April 9, 1998]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 8, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 10.

### **Remarks at Rachel Carson School in Chicago** *April 8, 1998*

Thank you very much. Thank you for making me feel so welcome at what is at least my third trip to the Chicago schools since I've been President.

I want to begin by thanking Rita Nicky for that wonderful introduction and for her obvious devotion to the children of this city. I thank very, very much Kathleen Mayer, the principal, for making me feel welcome. I'd also like to thank Catherine Garza, whose science class I visited. And I'd like to thank the students in the science class who showed me how to make a weather vane, and the young students who sang to me today, and all the students, indeed, of Rachel Carson, along with the teachers and the administrators and the staff. Thank you so much.

I thank Aldermen Coleman, O'Connor, and Burke for being here. I thank Congressman Gutierrez, but also Congressmen Davis, Rush, and Blagojevich, who are out here in front, for being here, for their support. [Applause] Thank you. And Senator Art Berman and Senator Dick Durbin. And Senator Carol Moseley-Braun I'll have more to say about later.

I want to thank the mayor and all of those who have cooperated with him, the members and the leaders of the teachers union, the parents, the administrators, everybody, in this remarkable attempt to revolutionize, revitalize, and energize the schools of the city of Chicago. It has been awesome to watch. But in particular I would like to thank the CEO of the Chicago board of education and the superintendent of schools, Paul Vallas and Gery Chico. They have done a wonderful job, and I thank them so much. Thank you, gentlemen.

But Mayor, none of it would have happened without you. And you believed that the kids of Chicago could learn and deserved a chance to learn and could have a future and deserved the chance to have that future. And when you got up here and you said you got tired of making excuses for failure and you decided to start making reasons for success, the whole crowd clapped. I wish that every public official in America had that simple creed. We'd be a lot better off as a country, and I thank you.

I also want to thank the Carson Choir and the Recorder Band, the people that provided music earlier.

Very often when I get up to speak I feel like that old joke at the banquet—where the banquet starts at 6 and everybody in the whole room either gets introduced or gets to talk. And the last speaker gets up at 10, and he says, "Everything that needs to be said has been said, but not everyone has said it." [Laughter] And somehow that's how I feel this morning, because so much that needs to be said has been said.

But I want to try to put this issue of modernizing our schools in a larger context for you, about what it means to prepare our country for the 21st century. It is just 632 days away. I'm gratified that most Americans think we're in good shape for that new century, because we have the strongest economy in a generation, 15 million new jobs, the lowest unemployment rate in a quarter-century, the lowest inflation in 30 years, the highest homeownership in history; first time crime has gone down this many years in a row since President Eisenhower was President. The welfare rolls are the lowest they've been in 27 years. That's all good.

But when things are changing as rapidly as they are now, we should use good times to think about the problems that remain today and the challenges that loom ahead tomorrow. It is a responsibility of good citizens in a democracy to bear down and do more in the good times, not to relax and pat ourselves on the back.

This meeting I had today, along with 23 community forums the Vice President and the Secretary of Education, Dick Riley, are having across the Nation, are all designed to discuss the importance, first, of modernizing the schools. Like Senator Durbin said, we all owe a debt of gratitude to Carol Moseley-Braun for sounding the alarm on this issue. She is the first person who ever talked to me about the possibility that the Federal Government should play a role. And so I said, "Well, look, I was a Governor for 12 years, and I spent more money on education than any of my predecessors. I raised more funds. I put more money into the schools. But the building decisions were always made at the district level."

And she gave the same speech to me years ago she gave to you today. She said, but that having good schools is a national priority. We spend money at the Federal level on roads that are the responsibility of the State and local government. We invest in that kind of infrastructure. But the most important infrastructure for tomorrow is the infrastructure of education. If we can be spending Federal money, as we are, to try to make sure we connect every classroom and library in the entire country to the Internet by the year 2000, don't we want the classroom to be fit to go to school in, and don't we want there to be enough to have small class sizes where we need it?

So she sold me, and ever since I've been trying to sell the country, which as usual is ahead of the politicians, and the Congress, which sometimes is a little behind the President. [Laughter] So we're working on this in Washington.

And I came back to Chicago because of all the exhilarating things that Chicago is doing, leading a revolution in public schools of high standards, accountability, rising expectations. Last year I came here to highlight the practice of ending the destructive policy

of social promotion but not letting the kids drift off and instead bringing them closer by giving them summer school opportunities.

Today the mayor told me there are now 240 schools plus in Chicago open after school every day for tutoring and academic work and to provide a decent dinner to poor students who need it, so the kids can actually get 3 meals a day in 240 schools. He said there had already been an evaluation of 40—of the first 40 schools where this 3-meals-a-day policy had been in effect, and the tutoring, and that 39 of them had shown dramatic gains in learning. This is not rocket science; this is taking care of our children. If Chicago can do it, everybody can do it.

So the mayor and I were talking yesterday about the ROTC program in the schools and what it does for young people, to be able to put on that uniform and feel the pride and find constructive things to do, and how they're being given a little extra consideration in being hired for other work that needs to be done in Chicago.

So Senator Carol Moseley-Braun, sitting here while we're talking, she said, "You know, I'm not sure we put enough money in the defense budget to take care of all the kids in the country that would like to be in ROTC. And there are a lot of kids in this country that that may be the only opportunity they ever get to learn the lessons they'll learn and become the kind of people they can become to do the kinds of things they can do." So I now have a new assignment from Senator Carol Moseley-Braun—[laughter]—and I am about to fulfill it when I go back to Washington.

I say this to you because this is big stuff here. This is exciting. All over the country, people, all kinds of people, have just sort of given up on public schools and the kids that are in them and the children whose first language is not English. And I'm telling you, that's crazy. I just got back from the poorest continent on Earth, Africa. I saw over half a million people in one sitting in Ghana. I went to rural villages. I talked to all kinds of people. I can tell you I believe more strongly that I ever have in my life that there is an even distribution of intelligence, energy, and potential among all human beings everywhere. The question is, are we doing what's

necessary to bring it out and to give kids the chance that they need?

So that's what this is about. I really like the fact that in her introduction Rita said, "Well, even in the old building, teachers work hard to do a good job." A lot of those classrooms are still open and they're appealing—I was kidding her, I went to a high school that was built in 1914. It's been closed for years. We're trying to renovate it and open it up as an arts center. But if you really want to make the old buildings work, it requires a lot of money, too. And our proposal would permit not only the building of new buildings but also the rehabilitation of old buildings—I mean the rehabilitation—opening the window, solving the problems that she mentioned, recovering them for positive purposes.

What does all this mean? At this school you've got reading and math scores up, attendance at almost 100 percent, all parents turning out for report card pickup day. This is a school of choice, a school of champions. And congratulations, by the way, to the fifth and sixth grade soccer team for winning the city title. But you're winning an even more important title in my mind by proving that our city public schools can work.

Now, if I were listening to this and I were in the same state of mind I was in before I became a convert, I would say, "Well, if the city of Chicago can put all this money into building new schools, why can't everybody?" I'll tell you why. Ask the mayor. There's a limit, even in these good economic times with these very low interest rates, in how much money that the markets will let any city borrow to build school buildings. There is also a limit to how much the taxpayers can pay, as Senator Carol Moseley-Braun said.

This is a national priority. I went to a school in Florida in a fairly modest-size community, where the kids in the school building were also going to school in 17 house trailers out back. Since last year we've got the largest number of children in our schools in the history of America. This is a problem not just in big cities; it's a problem in a lot of smaller towns and communities across this country.

One-third of all of our schools need major repairs. More than half have major building

problems. Nearly half don't have the wiring systems necessary to support my goal of hooking up every classroom to the Internet. Think of that. How bizarre is that? You have all these high-tech companies wanting to give you computers, hook you up to the Internet—I'm sorry, the wiring in the schools won't let us take our kids into the 21st century. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave our schools an F in its infrastructure report card this year, worst than in roads, bridges, mass transit, and every other category of investment.

Last week Congress passed billions of dollars for new roads, new bridges, and other public works. I believe that we should have a good road program. I believe that unsafe bridges should be repaired. I believe that the city streets ought to be in good shape. I believe that mass transit should be adequately funded. But I believe none of that will matter very much if we let the education system come crumbling down around our children.

I want these kids to be able to get on the subway in New York or the Dan Ryan Expressway in Chicago and be able to afford the ticket or afford a car and be going to a job where they can earn a good living because they've got a good education. You can't just have one kind of investment.

Now, the proposal in our balanced budget plan to help the schools do construction provides tax incentives to help communities modernize and build more than 5,000 schools. Our children deserve schools they can be proud of.

I want to help promote programs like after-school programs. We have funds for that. I have a program to reduce class size in the early grades all over the country and help schools hire teachers to do that. But if we pass the funds to provide help for the schools to stay open late, to tutor the kids, to feed the kids, do whatever needs to be done, and if we provide funds for more teachers to help get the class size down, you still have to have good classes in good buildings that are safe and clean, where there are good learning environments, and they are at least adequately organized so they can be part of the information superhighway. This is an important thing.

The work that is being done by your school leaders here, we can't do. Eighty percent of the schools in Chicago now, according to the mayor, are following the school uniform policy, which you know I love. I thought those kids looked great in their uniforms today. And I know—and the children that can't afford it, you have to find help to give them that. If you're going to have uniform policy, it's got to embrace all children.

But that's a decision that a local district has to make. The President can tell you how to do it legally and help support it morally, but that's a decision you have to make. You know, which schools should be open how many hours a day, what kind of tutoring programs you have, what you do with the ROTC program—that's a decision you've got to make here. How these children learn to speak English, if English is not their first language—I want to thank one of the students, Rosalia Delgado, who took me around this morning—how she learned to speak English—that's a decision you have to make.

But it is in the national interest to know that we have decent infrastructure for our schools, just as much as our national future depends upon a decent network of highways and a decent investment in mass transit. That is the idea that we have to convince the Congress on.

And when I can show people that, look what they're doing in Chicago; all they want us to do is to help, to create a framework in which they can have more success and a framework in which every other school in America can have the kind of success I saw here at Rachel Carson, I think we will have gone a long way.

So I came here to send that message out, and I ask you to help me send that message out and give your Members of Congress and the United States Senate a pat on the back for leading the way.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:58 a.m. in the courtyard. In his remarks, he referred to Rita Nicky, first grade teacher, who introduced the President; Catherine Garza, third grade teacher; 16th Ward Alderman Shirley A. Coleman; 40th Ward Alderman Patrick J. O'Connor; 14th Ward Alderman Edward M. Burke; State Senator Arthur L. Berman; and Mayor Richard M. Daley.

A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

**Statement on the United States-France Civil Aviation Agreement**

*April 8, 1998*

I am pleased that the United States has reached an agreement with France significantly increasing air service between our countries. The U.S.-France aviation market is our third largest in Europe. Until today, it was also our largest aviation market not governed by a bilateral agreement. This agreement will eliminate all restrictions on airline operations between the United States and France in 5 years. It will allow many more flights between our two countries and give U.S. airlines extensive new rights that will enhance their capacity to serve this market. This increased competition means more choice for American business travelers and tourists alike.

This agreement continues my efforts to open the world's markets in areas where American companies are most competitive. We have already concluded important aviation agreements with Japan, Germany, Canada, and many other nations. These agreements are part of our strategy to replace restrictions with opportunities—and move international aviation into a 21st century where consumers, not governments, determine how passenger and cargo needs are served.

I want to thank Secretaries Albright and Slater and the negotiators at the Departments of State and Transportation for their sustained efforts in reaching this agreement.

**Remarks at the  
Andrew W. Mellon Dinner**

*April 8, 1998*

Thank you very much, Mr. Laughlin. Mr. Powell, Mr. Smith, members of the Board of Trustees, Members of Congress and our administration, members of the Mellon family, ladies and gentlemen. It's a great honor for Hillary and me to be here tonight to honor this great legacy of Andrew Mellon

and to honor all of you who do so much to carry on that legacy.

I first came to the National Gallery over 30 years ago when I was a college student at Georgetown. Over the years I've come back as often as I could. When I came here from time to time as Governor of my home State, I confess that on occasion I sneaked out of the meetings of the Governors' Association and came to the National Gallery, where there was less noise and more light. [Laughter] Hillary and I have been privileged to visit here in the last few years to tour the Vermeer and Picasso exhibitions, among others.

It's hard to believe now that the National Gallery is 61 years old, founded when our country was in the grip of the Great Depression and the world was slipping inexorably toward World War II. But Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon knew that our Nation's work lay even then not simply in our monetary strength or our military power but in the value of our ideas, the creativity of our spirit, the power of our common culture. So he and a group of passionate men and women gave this great gift to the Nation and established a tradition of partnership that endures down to the very day.

There is no question that Paul Mellon carries on this tradition. His generosity has helped to invigorate and sustain our entire Nation's cultural and artistic institutions. Having already won the National Medal of Arts in 1985, last fall he was awarded the National Medal for the Humanities, which Robert Smith kindly accepted for him.

So tonight I want to thank him again and all the members of his family who have participated in giving other Americans, who could never have afforded these things on their own, access to this wonderful world.

When President Roosevelt dedicated the National Gallery, he said, "The dedication of this gallery to a living past and to a greater and more richly living future is the measure of the earnestness of our intention that the freedom of the human spirit shall go on."

Today, at the dawn of a new century and a new millennium, it falls to us to continue in that great tradition. Hillary and I have launched the White House Millennium Program to encourage all Americans to honor

our living past, with all its treasures, and to imagine our even more richly living future, with the creations and the discoveries yet to come.

I hope that all of you will find ways to join us in your homes, wherever you're from, in the coming months and years as we celebrate and commemorate the new millennium. But most of all, tonight I just want to thank you on behalf of a grateful nation for your dedication and your commitment to our common cultural and artistic life.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:15 p.m. in the West Building at the National Gallery of Art. In his remarks, he referred to Alexander Mellon Laughlin, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Earl A. Powell III, Director, Robert H. Smith, President, and Paul Mellon, Honorary Trustee, National Gallery of Art.

### **Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on Tobacco in Carrollton, Kentucky** *April 9, 1998*

**The President,** Well, good morning, everybody. The first thing I'd like to do is thank Mr. Lyons for hosting us, and thank all of you for being here. I thank the members of the panel and also I'd also like to thank Governor Patton and Senator Ford and Congressman Baesler for being here and riding down with me from the airport. And I thank Lieutenant Governor Henry, your State Auditor Edward Hatchett, Senate President Saunders, Senator Blevins, Speaker Richards. And I want to thank County Judge McMurtry and Mayor Welty, who came to meet me as well. And again, I'd like to thank Melvin and Brett Lyons for hosting us here. And I thank all of you for being here on the panel.

I know Secretary Glickman has already been down this way and been doing some work, but I'd like to make a few comments about where we are now in the evolution of this tobacco legislation. The first thing I'd like to do is to say a special word of appreciation to Wendell Ford. His work on the tobacco bill that's now moving through the Senate I think has been very valuable in trying to provide clear and certain protection to tobacco farmers, to warehouses, to com-

munities without compromising our long-term goal of reducing teen smoking. And I really want to say that he's been talking to me about this for years. He and Congressman Baesler have done a very good job of pushing your interests there in a way that is consistent with what we're trying to do in reducing teen smoking.

I also ought to say that while I'm here, Governor, I think it's only fitting that I begin these remarks by congratulating the University of Kentucky for winning the basketball tournament. As you know, Hillary and I were in Africa and I was getting up at amazing hours in the morning to watch these games. I had to watch the championship game on a tape, but that was really good.

Let me also say to those of you who are here and to the many thousands of people outside this warehouse that are listening to us or will be watching this, I am well aware that the people who farm tobacco and who work in this whole area have difficult jobs. I know that it's family work, small farms, hand work, that there was a flood in '97 and, the year before, blue mold which made the work more difficult, and that there is a lot of uncertainty now among people in this community, as I saw up and down the road all the way in here.

Last year, a settlement was announced between the tobacco companies and the State attorneys general to try to settle all their lawsuits with a set of agreements which would dramatically reduce teen smoking and provide some reimbursement to the State governments and to the Federal Government for the public health. But when that settlement was announced, there was absolutely nothing in there that would protect farmers in the event the overall volume of tobacco sales went down. And so, when I announced my reaction to their proposed settlement and what kind of legislation I would support in the Congress, I said that we had forgotten that and that tobacco farmers deserve protection and that I would not sign legislation that didn't have it in there. And I want to reaffirm that to you today.

Yesterday, some tobacco executives indicated that they were going to withdraw from the discussions with the Congress about legislation, but, despite that, I want to tell you

that I believe there's still a good chance we can get comprehensive legislation this year that will not leave the farmers behind. And again I want to say to them, we have no interest, whatever, in putting the tobacco companies out of business. I just want to get them out of the business of selling tobacco to children.

And I think it's important—I think every American recognizes that the tobacco farmers have not done anything wrong. You grow a legal crop, you're not doing the marketing of the tobacco to children, and you're doing your part as citizens. So what I want to hear from you today is about what you have to say to me that you want me and every member of our administration, every Member of Congress, and the country to know about this issue and where we go.

But let me just clearly state again what my concern is. We know that even though it's against the law in every State, 3,000 children a day start smoking and 1,000 of them will have their lives shortened because of it. That's my concern, overwhelmingly. But I do not want to do anything in dealing with that concern which will not honestly take account of the communities and the people and the families that are involved in tobacco farming.

It seems to me that you have a big interest in actually seeing legislation enacted as soon as possible if it provides adequate protection for the farmers because then we'll be helping the children, which I know you all want to do anyway, and we'll be doing it under terms where you'll actually have some certainty there—where you'll actually know what is going to happen, and you'll feel some level of security. And if the structure of Senator Ford's proposal prevails, then it would, as I understand it, would be consistent with the wishes of over 97 percent of the farmers in this area which voted in the referendum that's required every 3 years to keep the tobacco program intact.

So I've tried to get prepared, and I got an earful on the way down here, as I always do, from Wendell and Scotty and Paul, and I thank them for that. So I'd rather spend the rest of the time just listening to you. And I'd like to ask our host to open and maybe explain—keep in mind, you've got several members of the national press here, too, and

they will be reporting this to the country as a whole. And maybe, Mr. Lyons, it would be helpful if you could just very briefly explain what goes on in this warehouse, as if none of us knew anything about it, and how that fits with the tobacco farmers and what your concerns are with the legislation now pending in Congress.

There's a microphone. I think we can turn it up so you can speak into it. If you want to sit, you can; if you want to stand, you can. Do whatever makes you feel most comfortable.

*[Melvin Lyons, owner of the warehouse, thanked the President and gave a brief description of the warehouse and the process for moving tobacco from farms to manufacturers.]*

**The President.** I want to ask Mr. Kuegel to talk next, but I want to point out because this is one of the things that's important for the American people to understand why we need the kind of approach that Senator Ford has recommended that Mr. Baesler has a bill on in the House of Representatives.

You say that this will bring the farmers approximately \$5,000 an acre.

**Mr. Lyons.** Approximately.

**The President.** And what will be the net income to the farmer out of that \$5,000?

**Mr. Lyons.** It would vary. Some people are more efficient than others—probably \$2,000, \$2,500.

**The President.** Now, Mr. Kuegel, you're the president of the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative, and yet you've also been involved with the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids. So why don't you just comment—and bring that microphone over closer to you—why don't you tell us a little bit about the economics of tobacco, what you're trying to do, and how you believe that we can vigorously pursue this Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids and protect the interests of people whom you are elected to represent.

*[Mr. Kuegel described efforts to work with health groups to find common ground and describe how Senator Ford's "Leaf Act" would advance agricultural and economic development in Carrollton and protect the farmers from the tobacco companies.]*



**The President.** And basically, it protects you by preserving the structure of the program you now have, so that when the co-ops buys the tobacco, the farmers get the income immediately. The co-op holds the tobacco in storage until market conditions support the release of tobacco, its sale at an acceptable market price. Isn't that right?

[Mr. Kuegel concurred with the President's summary and expressed concern about some of the other proposals in Congress.]

**The President.** Well, based on what I understand—and I agree with you about that—I want to just make sure everyone understands this—the way the Ford bill works—and Wendell, if I make a mistake, pipe in here—

**Senator Ford.** You can bet on it. [Laughter]

**The President.** Poor, shy man. [Laughter]

The bill offers an up-front, generous buy-out proposal to people who want to get out, and the assumption is that there will be some, older people or others, who want to get out and that would, therefore, reduce the total number of producers. Then it keeps the program in place. Then if at some future date the demand goes even below that, there are substantial transition payments and assistance payments offered to communities, warehouses, and farmers.

And along the way, there are the kind of education and training benefits offered that we provide, for example, to people that are displaced when there are trade changes, changes in the American economy caused by trading flows that may benefit the overall economy but disadvantage people, so we owe them an extra bit of help to get started.

And I think there are two points to make here to those who would be skeptical about the approach that is being advocated. The first and the most important one is the one you've already said: At least to date, no one has figured out how to tell a tobacco farmer with a straight face that you should produce another crop and we will facilitate you getting into alternative crop production. The average farm in Kentucky is how big? Four acres, five acres?

**Mr. Kuegel.** Average tobacco production.

**The President.** Tobacco production, not farm but tobacco production. There is no known crop with the same income per acre. So if you were going to pay somebody to transition, one of the things you'd have to do is buy them all a whole lot more land. And I think that's a very important point to make.

The second point that needs to be made is, if you dismantle this program, you would not end the production of tobacco. You would end the ability of all these family farmers to produce tobacco, and you would probably create a structure more like what you see in some parts of California, where the ultimate processor in California, food processor—in this case the processor would be the cigarette companies—would control the farming and everybody would be a hired hand. And the income would all flow up except for a salary.

Isn't that basically your conclusion of what would happen?

**Mr. Kuegel.** I don't think there is any question that's what would happen. And it would be inevitable with Senator Lugar's bill if it does away with our tobacco program.

**The President.** So I think it's very important for the Members of the Congress, the members of the press, and people out in the country to understand that we don't want to be guilty of the law of unintended consequences here. What we're trying to do is improve the public health, cut teen smoking, get enough money into this program to deal with some of the larger health consequences in our society that have already developed. But we need to think a long time before we break down the structure that you see from the Cincinnati airport—which is in Kentucky—all the way driving here. And I think it's very, very important because I think this is a not very well-understood point.

I'd like to call on Amy Barkley next, who is the director of the Coalition for Health and Agricultural Development and involves public advocates actually working with farmers to address both the health and the economic issues. Amy, would you like to say anything about what we're discussing here?

[Ms. Barkley thanked the President and stated that health advocates had supported the tobacco program because they did not want

*tobacco farmers to become employees of tobacco companies. She stated that while she was a firm supporter of stopping teen smoking, she believed both goals should be reconciled to protect both the health of our youth and the future of the tobacco farmer.]*

**The President.** Let me ask you a question that I didn't ask Rod, and may be anybody feel free to comment. One of the things that occurs to me is, if we allow this program to lapse—let's suppose we have some version of the McCain bill. Now, the fight is going on now in Washington with tobacco companies as they say that it raises a lot more money from them than we had estimated. They say it will raise the price of cigarettes even more than we had estimated. They say it will cut consumption more than we had estimated. Therefore, they say they will be at great risk, and it's inconsistent with the original agreement.

And so we've got to work through all that. But one of the things that—the provisions for the tobacco farmers get almost no notice, but it occurs to me that if we were to abolish the program altogether, give everybody some sort of a cash payment for their allocation, and then just abolish the program, then what you think would happen I think would happen—first of all, that there would be no restrictions on production. And what I think would likely happen is there would be more tobacco grown at a lower price, which would make it uneconomical for you so the companies would take it over directly.

But from the point of view of our public health objective, if more tobacco is grown at a lower price, that undermines our desire to make a pack of cigarettes high enough in price that it will be part of what discourages children from smoking.

It seems to me that that's the public health angle here that someone like you, Amy—we need this highlighted from a public health point of view so that people in the vast, vast majority of our country that don't know anything about tobacco farming, don't have a dog in this hunt, and don't understand it, and don't want to make sure we're not doing something funny here—they need to understand that, ironically, if we dismantle this program, we might undermine the goals of reducing teen smoking.

I'd like to call on Mattie Mack now to talk a little bit about this from the point of view of an individual farmer. She's had an interesting family history on her farm, and I think I'll let her tell it to you, especially since we've apparently gotten her a local reporter in here. I hope we have. [Laughter]

[*Ms. Mack stated that the tobacco farmer should not be penalized because of children smoking and suggested that parents must play a greater role in keeping children from smoking. She described her life as a tobacco farmer, the economic struggles and benefits, and how she had raised her four children and 38 foster children on the farm, concluding that tobacco had made some good things possible.*]

**The President.** You guys didn't oversell her. [Laughter] It was just like you said it would be.

Let me call next on Karen Armstrong Cummings, because she's the managing director of the Commodity Growers Cooperative, which develops markets for family farm products. And they're interested in preserving the future of small farms.

So how are we going to preserve the small farms and do something about teen smoking? What options are there?

Could you give the microphone back, Rod?

[*Ms. Cummings described her participation in the Agriculture Department's National Commission on Small Farms which developed over 140 recommendations to get USDA's policies focused on the family farm and insofar as tobacco was concerned, the tobacco program was essential to continued existence of family farms in the Southeast.*]

**The President.** Thank you. This is really not exactly the time or place for this, but if you get beyond tobacco and you look at other small farm issues, the reason this program has worked for small farmers is that you've had—first of all, you've had an allocation system which keeps the price within some bonds, although it varies still quite a bit as all of you know, depending on weather conditions and other things.

And because you've got this co-op system that really works to give the farmer cash

money on the front end, even if the big tobacco companies, cigarette companies, don't pay you right away, the co-op will. And I think we really need to look at this again. It's off the subject we're here to meet about today but before I leave office in 2001, I really hope that we will have been able to set up an alternative framework of policies that will enable family farmers who live in places where this is not even an optional crop, where they've got to do something else, and where they're doing what most tobacco farmers do—they have some income from off the farm and some income from on the farm to be able to continue to do that.

The whole theory behind this whole—going to a completely free market in agriculture was that you would get more efficient production. But the truth is the family farmers that have been put out of business, by and large, have not been put out of business from inefficiency of production, they have been put out of business because they didn't have enough cash to stand the bad years. At least that is my belief. That is what I think based on my experience in a totally different agricultural environment.

*[Ms. Cummings stated that whole issue of access to capital and the lending system needed to be reviewed. One of her organization's recommendations was for a Presidential commission to look at market concentrations in the agricultural sector.]*

**The President.** If you look at how you sell cattle or, especially, how increasingly hog operations are going and you compare that to how the tobacco co-op works as a buyer of last resort, so that the cash is transferred to the farmer immediately and someone else basically is holding the crop until it can be sold and paying the price of holding the crop—I mean, it gives you some idea of what—it would be good if we could figure out a way to do.

Now, it's very different with live animals. You still have to feed, you still have to—they don't warehouse too well, and you still have to feed them. So I don't—none of these issues are simple. If they were simple we wouldn't have to worry about them. But I do think you made a good point.

And I want to get back to the subject at hand, but I promise you I'll spend some time on this because it's very important to me to see that we don't lose every small farmer in America just because of the structure of the money economy, the finance economy, as opposed to the efficiency of the operation. I'm not interested in protecting any inefficient operators who can't compete, but I have seen enough crops come in now over the course of my life in enough different areas to believe that it's more the way the money economy is structured and the way the products are brought to market than the efficiency of the farmer that's changed the structure of farming.

The reason you've got all these small farmers here is you've got the allocation, the limited production, and the cooperative buyer. I believe that.

Mr. Sprague, do you want to go next? You're the president of the Kentucky Farm Bureau, and I understand you're a fifth generation farmer. And you have 3,000 acres of crop; that makes you a big tobacco farmer—it makes you a small rice farmer in Arkansas and a big tobacco farmer in Kentucky. *[Laughter]*

*[Mr. Sprague, stated that the tobacco generated \$1 billion worth of income for Kentucky farmers and that it generated 3 or 4 times as it goes through the economy. He indicated that the present situation regarding tobacco created uncertainty in the whole tobacco industry and said that the Nation needed a policy at the national level that would give stability to the industry.]*

**The President.** Let me, if I could—and I would invite—I know I've got two more panelists I want to call on, and I would invite any of you to kick in. You have stated a sort of summary of where you are and where you think the farmers are so well, I think it might be worthwhile to go back to the beginning here.

Let's remember how this whole thing came up. There were two things going on. First of all, the Federal Food and Drug Administration opened an inquiry and found, as a factual matter, that there was an effort made to market tobacco products to young people, that it was not only against the law

but it was likely to become more addictive to them if kids started smoking when they were young rather than if they started after they were adults when they might use it more in moderation and all that, and that the health consequences were considerable. That was the finding.

Simultaneously, they had a number of States that filed suits against the tobacco companies, claiming that they had marketed cigarettes to children in violation of the law all these years, and that that had led to not only injury to the individuals, but vast costs to the States through their medical programs. And then there were the private lawsuits, the people that got lung cancer and all.

And all these things came together, and the tobacco companies and basically the State attorneys general and the representatives of the private plaintiffs came up with their proposed settlement in which they agreed, among other things, to pay more money to defray some of the health care costs, to run up the price of cigarettes some to make it less attractive, and to reduce—change their advertising practices.

But in order to get all that done, comprehensively they had to pass a bill through Congress because they also have to deal with the Federal Food and Drug Administration program. So now we're in a situation where, as you pointed out, there are lots of different agendas here and lots of different things going on.

I do believe, however, that there is a bipartisan majority of people in the Congress in both Houses, in both parties, who honestly just want to do as much as they reasonably can to reduce smoking by young people as quickly as they reasonably can, in a way that does not put the tobacco companies out of business, and even more important to most of us, is not really unduly unfair to you.

So what you're saying to me is that right now the uncertainty is the worse enemy you have, and what we need is to get this thing done in Congress this year, do it in a way that achieves our goal of driving down teen smoking as much as we can, as fast as we can, and let you know what the rules are.

Now, let me ask you just specifically—I mean, I assume you believe this, but you didn't say it explicitly—it seems to me that

the greatest balance of certainty for the farmers in our efforts to reduce teen smoking is in some version of what Senator Ford has proposed. That is, if you assume that—let's just assume that through whatever means—the American Medical Association, for example, says that because there are so many kids out there more or less on their own, that the advertising has a bigger impact on inducing kids to start smoking even than peer pressure does. So if you assume all that, then it seems to me the best proposal is something like—something that would offer a buy-out that is generous and fair and adequate to people that want to get out because there is no easy substitution, as all of you have said.

Then for all those that don't get out—because you assume that if all the kids start—if you cut teen smoking in half, then, within some number of years, the aggregate demand for tobacco in America will go down. So some people get out, and you pay them a legitimate price to get out; then the other people who are still in, operate under a program that controls production and gives the family farmers a chance to survive. That's basically what Wendell wants to do.

And in addition to that, since maybe there won't be enough people get out for the market reduction—we don't know that—it also provides a structure within which you get aid to warehouses, aid to communities, and aid to individuals for continuing education and training, as I've said, just the same way we would with people that are dislocated from trade. If we pass something like that, is that the best thing to do? I mean, is that basically what you would recommend that we do?

*[Mr. Sprague said that he believed so but indicated that about half the tobacco grown was for export and that efforts to reduce exports would be detrimental to farmers. He indicated he would like to see the exports continue.]*

**The President.** Okay. Marissa, would you like to talk a little bit about how you view this issue?

*[Marissa Vaught, whose grandmother died of cancer, expressed her opposition to youth smoking but said raising taxes on cigarettes would make it harder for people from Kentucky to put food on the table.]*

**The President.** What do you think the most effective—I should say that Marissa is, I think, a junior at Carroll County High School—is that right? What do you think the most effective thing we could do to reduce teen smoking? Let me just say, there are lots of people who think the most effective thing you could do is just make cigarettes a lot more expensive. There are other people who think the most effective thing you can do is to stop the cigarette companies from doing any advertising that could be specifically or extra appealing to young people. Then there are people who think that there is nothing you can do except to try to get the parents and the religious leaders and the community leaders to try to teach kids not to do it in the first place.

What is your sense of what the most effective thing that we could do to discourage your peers from beginning to smoke?

[*Ms. Vaught indicated that she thought it would be helpful to show the positive side on not smoking rather than to stress punishment.*]

**The President.** Do you believe that most teenagers actually do know and believe that it is dangerous?

**Ms. Vaught.** I do believe that they actually do. But sometimes people really don't care.

**The President.** When you're 16 you think you're going to live forever, don't you?

**Ms. Vaught.** Exactly. They don't know—

**The President.** I did. [*Laughter*]

**Ms. Vaught.** —that it's going to hit you. Consequences are hard, and they do come fast and slow. They think they're going to live forever, and I'm going to die anyway. But it's how you die that is important. I think that your health and safety is important, especially on teens.

**The President.** So you think if we could—that's what Bill said. He said, if his daddy gave him \$1,000 if he didn't smoke by the time he was 21—

**Ms. Vaught.** Yes, that's positive incentive.

**The President.** So you think a positive—some sort of positive incentive program would be effective?

**Ms. Vaught.** Exactly. I do think that. It worked for you, obviously. It works for teens.

**The President.** Thank you.

Dr. William Goatley is the pastor of the First Baptist Church in Eminence, Kentucky. I thought we ought to give him a chance to say whether he thinks the religious community should have any role in this whole issue.

Doctor?

[*Dr. Goatley said that tobacco was a way of life and a type of livelihood for people in Kentucky and that there had to be an alternative livelihood as part of the solution. He said the President should continue his crusade against youth smoking.*]

**The President.** Thank you very much. That was a very moving statement to me. No one knows exactly why, but, for whatever reason, we know that teen smoking has, in fact, been on the rise. And the overwhelming—I say again, we can't lose sight of the big issue—the overwhelming evidence is that 3,000 children begin to smoke every day, and 1,000 of them will have their life shortened because of it, and that the rest of us as taxpayers will pay enormously for them. But the most important cost is human, not economic.

And the question is whether we can pursue a reasonable course to deal with that and deal with the human reality of the livelihood and the life and the structure of life that all of these fine people have been talking around the table and have described today.

I think the answer is yes. And as I said, I think, ironically, trying to preserve the structure will actually—since no one suggested tobacco is not a legal crop and that adults should not be free to buy it, that that is not a position advocated by anybody—nobody's advocating prohibition here—ironically, it seems to me, that our objectives in reducing teen smoking by making it both more expensive and less attractive in other ways, and dealing with the advertising is actually furthered by preserving this program because it will reduce production and keep the price up.

If you abolish the program, you put a lot of these folks out of business, but you will not reduce production. You'll probably increase production, lower the price of tobacco and, therefore, make cigarettes cheaper, notwithstanding whatever we do with the tax or

a voluntary payment or whatever we wind up calling it when Congress acts.

So anyway, I thank you for that. Secretary Glickman, would you like to say anything?

*[Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman described his visits to Kentucky and efforts underway to deal with the situation and closed by saying that he was looking to economic development options rather than alternative crops programs as a significant part of the solution.]*

**The President.** Let me just make one other request of all of you. I will certainly try to do what you've asked me to do; that is, I'm going to do my dead-level best to get the legislation passed this year that will not only dramatically reduce teen smoking, but will provide some certainty to you and some legitimate protection for the tobacco farmers and the warehouses and their communities. So I will try to do that.

But let me ask you to do something, because you've really piqued my interest here, both what our pastor said and what Marissa said, what you said, Bill, what you said, Mattie, about parents' responsibility. I have spent quite a bit of time with young people's groups, the youth organizations all over the country, from New York City to small towns in California, of young people who are organized to try to get their peers not to smoke and who also often go from store to store to store to test whether the sellers of cigarettes are actually even making modest efforts to do anything about it.

And I respect that because I think it's wrong to put all the responsibility here on the manufacturers. It's not like these children and their parents and their families and their schools and their churches are just ciphers that have no will, have no knowledge, have no nothing. I mean, they get up every day and go through life, too. And I wish you would get some thought to—as a practical matter, I don't know that the Government could offer every 18-year-old \$1,000 on their 18th birthday if they could prove they never smoked a cigarette, but there may be some other things we could do in the area of getting young people to assume more responsibility and providing some rewards and doing some things that we haven't thought

And Marissa, the other thing, we may not have been as creative about that whole element of this as we can be, and I'd be willing to think about that.

**Ms. Vaught.** There is a teacher who talked to me about this, and he said maybe college scholarships for nonsmokers, maybe a non-smoking scholarship for students who happen to do well in school and are non-smokers.

**The President.** We'll look at that. We'll figure out what the cost of that would be. You may be right; it may be cheaper than some of the other stuff we're doing. *[Laughter]* I'll do that, I'll look into that.

You were great all of you. Thank you very much. Let's give them a hand. Weren't they great? *[Applause]* Very impressive. Thanks.

NOTE: The discussion began at 11:08 a.m. at the Kentuckiana Warehouse. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Paul E. Patton and Lt. Gov. Stephen L. Henry of Kentucky; State Auditor Edward B. Hatchett, Jr., State Senator Larry Saunders, president, and State Senator Walter Blevins, Jr., president pro tempore, Kentucky Senate; State Representative Jody Richards, speaker, Kentucky House of Representatives; Judge Gene McMurtry, Carroll County; Mayor Bill Welty of Carrollton; and Melvin and Brett Lyons, owners, Kentuckiana Warehouse.

## Remarks at Carroll County High School in Carrollton

April 9, 1998

Thank you very much. Now, Jackie was a little nervous before she came up, but I think she did a great job, don't you? *[Applause]* She mentioned your other two classmates, Marissa and Josh, who were over at the other meeting in the warehouse, and they were also very, very good, and you could have been very proud of them.

I could have done without Jackie reminding me that Kentucky beat Arkansas not once, not twice, but 3 times this year. But I cheered for you anyway in the tournament. *[Laughter]*

And let me say, I'm delighted to be here with my good friends Governor Patton and Senator Ford, and I thank them for their leadership for you and for all of Kentucky.

I thank Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman for coming down here with me today, and for being here last week and for his tireless work for the farmers of America.

I thank Congressman Scotty Baesler for flying down here with me today and also bending my ear about the needs of farmers and the communities; and Lieutenant Governor Henry; your auditor, Edward Hatchett; Senator Saunders; Senator Blevins; Speaker Jody Richards and Mayor Welty, and Judge McCurry. I thank all of them for being here with me.

I thank your superintendent and your principal for welcoming me to your school. And I'd also like to thank the people, in addition to the students who were mentioned, who met with me over at the tobacco warehouse a few moments ago to discuss both this community's desire to prevent teenagers from smoking and to preserve the way of life for the tobacco farmers and their families. And I'd just like to acknowledge them—they're over here—Melvin Lyons, the owner of the Kentuckiana Tobacco Warehouse; Rod Kuegel, the president of the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative; Amy Barkley, the director of the Coalition for Health and Agricultural Development; Mattie Mack, a tobacco farmer who has raised 4 children and 38 foster children on her tobacco farm; Bill Sprague, the president of the Kentucky Farm Bureau; Dr. Wilbert Goatley, the pastor of the First Baptist Church of Eminence, Kentucky; and Marissa, Josh—you all stand up, all of you. Thank you very much for being here for us today. Thank you.

I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation to the vice chairman of Humana, David Jones, who was part of the Presidents' Summit on Citizen Service last April in Philadelphia and has committed \$2 million and 50,000 community service hours to help stop tobacco use by children. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, before I get into my speech, I need to say a few words about the terrible losses suffered by our neighbors in Alabama and Georgia as a result of the tornadoes that swept through there last night. If you've been looking at the television, you've seen how awful it has been. Today I am declaring a major disaster in three Ala-

bama counties, Jefferson, St. Clair, and Tuscaloosa; adding to the number of counties already declared in the State of Georgia; and ordering more Federal aid to those areas. I have spoken to our FEMA director, James Lee Witt, and I've asked Mr. Witt and our Vice President, Al Gore, to go down to Alabama and Georgia tomorrow to look at the damage.

But if you have been seeing it on television, it's quite amazing, and I hope you'll all say a prayer for those folks tonight and join with them in spirit as they begin to rebuild.

Speaking of rebuilding, it's good to see how you have recovered from the flood of '97, when Eagle Creek and the Kentucky River were spilling out all over this county. It's a great moment of resilience for Kentucky and a golden moment for our country. Communities all across America are thriving. We have the strongest economy in a generation, the lowest unemployment rate in 25 years, the lowest inflation in 30 years, the highest rate of homeownership in the entire history of America. We have the lowest crime rate in 24 years, and crime has gone down 5 years in a row for the first time since the 1950's, when even I was younger than most of you in this audience. We have the lowest welfare rolls in 27 years. Things are going in a good direction in this country.

We've tried to open the doors of college to all Americans. Now, all of you students, your families can get a \$1,500-a-year tax credit for the first 2 years of college tuition and tax credits for the junior and senior year, for graduate school, for adults who have to go back to school; a better student loan program; more work-study grants; more Pell grants.

I think it's really possible for us to say to every young person in America, for the first time in the history of this country if you will work hard and make your grades and you want to go to college, money should now not keep you from going. We have opened the doors of college to all Americans.

I understand that the chemical and steel industries here in Carroll County are booming and virtually guaranteeing jobs to students who are involved in your remarkable

work-study program and getting the essential math, science, and technical skills you need.

Today, as all of you know, I came here to talk about the urgent national need to deal with the problem of more and more of our young people beginning to smoke, even though it's illegal to sell cigarettes to minors in every State in the country, and to talk about how that could impact the future of tobacco—tobacco farmers and tobacco communities.

I know there has been a lot of discussion in this area and, indeed, all over Kentucky about what this tobacco legislation in Congress involves and where we are in the process. So today I came here, first, to listen to the concerns of the people that I introduced over there who were trying to speak in a way for all of you and, second, to tell you where I think we're going with this.

But let me begin by making three points. First, we have an historic opportunity to pass bipartisan legislation this year which both contains the elements necessary to reduce teen smoking in America and provides adequate protection for tobacco communities. And I'm going to do everything I can to put politics aside and pass legislation that will achieve that objective.

Second, the legislation we seek is not about politics or money or Senator Ford seeking revenge on the tobacco industry. I don't want to put the tobacco companies out of business. I do want to put them out of the business of selling cigarettes to teenagers.

Third, it is important not to abandon the tobacco farmers, the warehouses, the communities, who have not done anything wrong, who have not marketed cigarettes to teenagers, who have worked hard to grow and sell a legal crop and been good, honest, tax-paying citizens. I will not support any legislation in this area that does not contain adequate protection for your farmers and your communities.

You know, when the flood waters were rising out of control here, not only you but all of your fellow citizens all across America just took it as a given that we had a national responsibility to help you deal with the flood and its aftermath and get back to normal.

When the terrible earthquake hit California, and you saw pictures of our representa-

tives going to California to try to help those folks restore normal life and spending a lot of money to rebuild their highways and rebuild one great university out there, I'll bet you hardly anybody in Kentucky resented the fact that the National Government was helping them.

When the Mississippi River overflowed its banks a few years ago and we had a 500-year flood, most people in Kentucky, I bet anything, did not object to the work we did to try to help the people in Iowa and Missouri.

Last year, when that town in North Dakota, that beautiful little town, was both flooded and burned at the same time, I bet all of us were pulling for the mayor up there and the citizens and glad to help.

When we have big economic upheavals, we must do the same thing. So if we succeed in reducing—here's the bottom line—if we succeed in reducing teen smoking, then sooner or later we will reduce the overall demand for tobacco. Can we do that and still do right by the families who grow tobacco, by the warehouses, by the communities? I think the answer to that is yes. And that's what the legislation has to do, so let me describe it—because otherwise, you can't say, "Oh, I'm for reducing teen smoking, but I don't want you to do anything about it."

By definition, if you reduce teen smoking, the volume will go down. Let's not pretend, just because I'm in Kentucky, that this is an easy problem. There's no point in pretending something is true that isn't. If you reduce teenage smoking, as is the right thing to do morally and from a health point of view and the law requires, it will reduce, sooner or later, the overall volume of tobacco required. How can you do that and be fair to the tobacco farmers and their communities? That is the issue here.

Now, I think we can do it. But first of all, you have to decide if you think it's important. Everybody says it, but do you believe that? Just last week, the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta released a disturbing report that found that more than 40 percent of American teenagers now smoke or chew tobacco. Now, the law says that tobacco companies can't advertise tobacco products on television or radio, but the ads are everywhere



else, in magazines, sport arenas, billboards, toy race cars, something not many adults buy. Not long ago, a national survey showed more young children recognized Joe Camel than Mickey Mouse. Today and every day, about 3,000 young people begin to smoke, and the evidence is conclusive that 1,000 of the 3,000 will have their lives shortened as a result.

Now, one of the things that has poisoned the political atmosphere is that the tobacco companies—nobody has any animosity against the farmers—but for years and years and years, the companies denied that they were marketing to children until all these lawsuits were filed and the information was drug out. And now every month, there's a new set of information which shows that not only were they knowingly advertising in a way that was especially appealing to children but that there were direct-marketing campaigns designed to get people involved before they were 18 to keep the number of cigarette smokers high. Now, that has come out. It wasn't volunteered; it wasn't told; it's been pulled out. And that has created this climate that exists in Washington and has resulted in all these lawsuits being filed.

What I want to do is to say, look, what's past is past, but what we want to do is to do all the things necessary to stop advertising and marketing tobacco to kids; to do things that will actually reduce teen smoking so more of you will live longer, better, healthier lives; and to do it in a way that protects the tobacco farmers and the communities—and again I say, doesn't put the tobacco companies out of business, just gets them out of the business of selling to children.

Now, last week, a key Senate committee on which Senator Ford sits approved by 19 to 1 a bill sponsored by John McCain, a Republican, and Senator Fritz Hollings of South Carolina, a Democrat, that we believe would cut teen smoking by half over the next decade. And thanks to Senator Ford's leadership, it contained provisions which will do what I said we have to do and also protects tobacco farmers and their communities. It recognizes that a lot of what people have been saying to tobacco farmers for years is just unrealistic, "Well, why don't you just go grow some other crop on the land?" There is no other crop that has anything like the

same return per acre that tobacco does, and most tobacco farmers have small plots of tobacco, earning quite a high yield per acre.

What does it do? It offers, first of all, a very generous buyout for people that want to stop producing now—very generous—so that they can have more than enough money to spend the investment doing something else to generate income.

Secondly, it says that if, over time, there is further reduction in demand, it provides more funds to help warehouses, communities, and provide very generous education benefits to people who are involved in the work.

And the third thing it does is to preserve the existing program for people who stay in it so that there will finally be some certainty instead of all the uncertainty that's been hanging over the families and communities like this one for so many years. The president of your State farm bureau said the most important thing we need now is to have legislation passed this year that will reduce teen smoking but will give these farmers and their families and their communities some certainty. That is what we want to do.

Yesterday, for whatever reasons, some of the tobacco executives indicated that they might not participate anymore in negotiating this bill, either because they think the bill that passed out of the Senate committee was too hard or because they're afraid it'll get worse. I don't know exactly what. I will say this, we have to have some financial incentives on them to in fact reduce the rate of teen smoking; otherwise we will have done all this for nothing. I'm not just trying to raise a bunch of money to raise money or to raise the price of cigarettes. The goal is to make America's children healthier.

And so I hope they will reconsider, because I'm determined to get this done this year. I heard today that the people here in this county do not want any more uncertainty. They want us to act. It would be better if we could act with the tobacco companies at the table too, so we're all talking together, so we're all sharing our information, so we all at least agree on the facts if we don't agree on the solutions. So I hope they'll reconsider and become a part of this. But we're going

to do this, this year. If I can control the outcome, we will actually act this year.

I don't think this is a time for threats by anybody. This is a time to put the past behind us, look ahead to the future, and achieve all these objectives. If we move forward with the legislation in the Senate and it does what it's supposed to do, it will stop about 60,000 children a year in Kentucky from beginning to use tobacco over the next 5 years. That means that 20,000 children a year in this State will live longer, healthier, fuller lives. I think that's worth the effort.

Let me also say, Mattie Mack, the farmer I mentioned who raised her own children and 38 foster children, gave me a pretty good little lecture about the responsibility of the people who buy or receive tobacco products and their parents and that we shouldn't put all this on the sellers. And so I say to all of you students, I hope that you are taking responsibility for your own future, and if you haven't started smoking, I hope you won't. I don't believe that the Wildcats could have left all of their opponents gasping for breath, could have come from behind repeatedly to win the tournament, if their lungs had been incapacitated. And I don't think you do either.

Again, I want to encourage you also to work with each other. I have a young friend here who's from another community in Kentucky who has become a pen-pal of mine. Her name is Meghan Johnson. Stand up, Meghan. She's a seventh grader from Madison County, Kentucky. And she's been writing me very interesting letters for the last few years. And so now, when one of Meghan's letters comes in, everybody in the office clamors to read it because she always says something rather unconventional and interesting. Like so many of you, in her youth she is brutally honest about whatever it is she's writing about.

She's taken a big stand against tobacco in her community. After seeing two people close to her stricken with cancer, she and some of her friends decided to produce a video and a poster to help convince every student in her middle school—understand the dangers of smoking.

And Meghan and all of you young people here today are the future of your State and

our Nation. If you want to do this and do it right, we can do it. We don't have to wreck the fabric of life in your community. We don't have to rob honest people of their way of life. But even in tobacco country, we can't deny what the scientists have told us or what has been done to market tobacco to children in ways that compromise their future. To me, no company's bottom line is important compared to America's bottom line. America's bottom line should be your life, your future, your health. And for me, that's what it is.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:14 p.m. in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Carroll County High School students Jacqueline Jones, who introduced the President, Marissa Vaught, and Josh Coombs; and Judge Gene McMurry, Carroll County.

### **Remarks Honoring the NCAA Football Champion Michigan Wolverines and the Nebraska Cornhuskers**

*April 9, 1998*

**The President.** Welcome. We've had a lot of heavyweights in this room in the past but nothing to compare with this today. [*Laughter*]

Coach Osborne, Coach Carr, President Bollinger, Chancellor Moeser, Congressman Levin, Congressman Dingell, Congressman Upton. And I can't help noting today the presence of my National Economic Adviser, Gene Sperling, an alumnus of the University of Michigan. The only time he ever stops work is when Michigan plays football. [*Laughter*]

I am honored to have all of you here to celebrate the remarkable seasons of two great football teams from two great universities. For the entire season, everybody in America, especially in the last month or so, wanted Michigan and Nebraska to meet. I'm the only person who could pull it off. [*Laughter*] Since the sun is out, we ought to just go outside and settle the whole thing. [*Laughter*] We'll call it the Rose Garden Bowl. [*Laughter*]

In alphabetical order, we'll start with Michigan. All of America was awed by your

performance in one of the most exciting Rose Bowls in history. A team that never lost its poise and never lost a game. Charles Woodson was terrific all season long, and deserved to be the first primarily defensive player to win the Heisman Trophy. The outstanding defense was complemented by a fierce offense, quarterbacked by Rose Bowl MVP Brian Griese.

I'd also like to say a word about Coach Carr. The man who brought Michigan its first championship in 50 years, he has quickly established himself as one of the best coaches in college football. Congratulations on taking the Wolverines to the championship in only your third season.

Now I'd like to introduce you, Coach, to say a few words.

Coach Carr.

*[At this point, University of Michigan Coach Lloyd Carr thanked the President and made brief remarks. Wolverine cocaptains Jon Jansen and Eric Mayes then presented gifts to the President.]*

**The President.** Thank you. As long as I can be on injured reserve for the next game. *[Laughter]* Thank you.

And now, a team that lived up to all the great traditions of Nebraska football. The Cornhuskers' overwhelming victory in the Orange Bowl was a fantastic finish to an undefeated season. The offense put 42 points on the board, led by tailback Ahman Green's 206 rushing yards, quarterback Scott Frost's three rushing touchdowns.

The 206 yards registered with me because I was in the stands in the Orange Bowl in 1978 when Roland Sales of Arkansas rushed for 205 yards. *[Laughter]*

The Nebraska defense also did a magnificent job in stifling the Peyton Manning-led offense of Tennessee that had been so strong all year.

For Coach Tom Osborne, the Orange Bowl victory marked a spectacular close to a spectacular 25-year career that included three national championships and 255 wins. Tom Osborne is truly one of the great legends of college football. His name now will inevitably be ranked in history along with

Knute Rockne, Bear Bryant, and Pop Warner.

Congratulations, Coach, and thank you for not only all the wins, but for the way you did it and the example you set.

Coach Osborne.

*[At this point University of Nebraska coach, Tom Osborne, thanked the President and made brief remarks. The new Cornhusker coach, Frank Soler, and team captains Grant Wistrom, Jason Peter, and Aaron Taylor then presented gifts to the President.]*

**The President.** It's beautiful. Thank you.

Now, what are we supposed to do? Usually, I'm supposed to—we're going to go out here and do the receiving line and the pictures, right?

Thanks again for coming. Congratulations to both of you on a magnificent year. And thanks for all the thrills you gave the rest of us who sit in the stands and watch on television. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:37 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Lee C. Bollinger, University of Michigan, and Chancellor James C. Moeser, University of Nebraska.

## Statement on the Resignation of John Garamendi as Deputy Secretary of the Interior

*April 9, 1998*

It is with regret that I accept the resignation of John Garamendi as Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

For almost 3 years, John has been a very important member of my administration and has successfully handled some of the toughest and most complicated issues in one of the largest and most important agencies in the Federal Government. From California water issues to the protection of Headwaters redwoods, John's ability to find common ground and creative solutions has been a great asset.

I wish him the best for the future.

**Message on the Observance of  
Easter, 1998**

*April 9, 1998*

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Easter.

Just as nature renews the earth each spring, so does the celebration of the resurrection of Jesus Christ enliven our spirits. During this holy season, Christians across America and throughout the world rejoice at the good news of salvation and the re-creation of God's perfect world.

On this day of hope and joy, we are also in the midst of one of the most challenging and exciting periods in our nation's history. From the life of Jesus, we can draw strength for the vital tasks that lie before us: to unite our nation of diverse races, cultures, and backgrounds; to widen the circle of opportunity for all our people; and to build lasting bridges of understanding and respect among the nations of the world.

As Americans gather at sunrise services and in churches across the country, Hillary joins me in extending best wishes for a blessed Easter.

**Bill Clinton**

NOTE: This message was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 9.

**Proclamation 7079—National  
Former Prisoner of War Recognition  
Day, 1998**

*April 9, 1998*

*By the President of the United States  
of America*

**A Proclamation**

Engraved on the Korean War Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C., are the words "Freedom Is Not Free." Generations of Americans who have served our Nation in uniform know the truth of this inscription. They have paid freedom's price by leaving behind their homes, families, and civilian lives to serve America around the globe. They have paid the price by suffering injuries and even death. And some have paid the price for our freedom by sacrificing their own as prisoners of war.

While in captivity, American prisoners of war have served our Nation with the same valor, pride, honor, and dedication as their comrades on the battlefield. American POWs have struggled for their freedom, armed with courage, wits, and an indomitable spirit. Enduring long months or years of hunger, abuse, torture, isolation, and the dreadful suspense of not knowing when—or if—they would ever be released, they have remained true to themselves and to our country.

This year we commemorate the 25th anniversary of Operation Homecoming, when we finally achieved the release of our prisoners of war from captivity in Southeast Asia. We also mark the anniversary of Operations Big Switch and Little Switch some 45 years ago, when Americans held captive during the Korean War finally came home. As these heroes returned to the open arms of their families and the grateful hearts of their fellow Americans, we saw written on their faces their deep love for our country and the faith, determination, and sense of honor that had sustained them through times of unimaginable suffering.

We can never adequately express our gratitude to those who have served our Nation while prisoners of war or to their families who experienced such anguish during years of separation. But on this day, and throughout the year, we can and should pay tribute to these extraordinary American patriots, thank them for their service and their sacrifice, and honor them always in our hearts.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 9, 1998, as National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day. I call upon all Americans to join me in remembering former American prisoners of war who suffered the hardships of enemy captivity. I also call upon Federal, State, and local government officials and private organizations to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-eight, and of the Independence of the United

States of America the two hundred and twenty-second.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., April 10, 1998]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 13.

**Proclamation 7080—National D.A.R.E. Day, 1998**

*April 9, 1998*

*By the President of the United States of America*

**A Proclamation**

Every child is blessed with infinite potential—potential for loving, for learning, and for making life better for others. Yet each year thousands of young people destroy this potential and risk their lives by using illegal substances. That is why the first goal of my 1998 National Drug Control Strategy is to educate America's young people on the dangers of substance abuse and to help them resist the temptations of drugs, alcohol, and tobacco.

Among our greatest allies in this mission are the parents, teachers, students, and police officers participating in Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.), the largest substance abuse prevention and safety promotion program in America. This year, millions of children across the United States will benefit from the D.A.R.E. curriculum. Under the guidance of specially trained veteran police officers, America's children from kindergarten through 12th grade learn how to resist peer pressure and live productive lives free from violence and substance abuse. The D.A.R.E. program is currently being used in almost 75 percent of our Nation's school districts and in more than 44 countries around the world. And because it is so critical that we reach our young people during their most impressionable years, D.A.R.E. has pledged to expand into every middle school in our Nation by the year 2001.

Every American should reinforce D.A.R.E.'s efforts by accepting responsibility to join the fight against drugs and violence.

Parents must set a good example, teach their children right from wrong, and educate them about the dangers of substance abuse. Young people themselves must have the courage to reject violence and drugs. And we must all support our Nation's D.A.R.E. officers in their mission to help our children reject illegal drugs. It is only by working together that we can create a brighter future for our children, our communities, and our Nation.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 9, 1998, as National D.A.R.E. Day. I call upon our youth, parents, and educators and all people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate programs and activities.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-second.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:48 a.m., April 10, 1998]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 13.

**Remarks at a Reception Honoring Senator Barbara A. Mikulski**

*April 9, 1998*

This is exhibit A for everything I believe in in politics. You know, Senator Mikulski just reeled off my week to you, and we just got home from—Hillary and I did—from this incredible 12-day trip to Africa. And I have been in all those places she said, so I was tired when I got here. But if you stand this close to Barbara Mikulski for 5 minutes, I could get down and do 100 push-ups right now. *[Laughter]* I want to go out and run around the block. *[Laughter]*

Let me say, all of you know I do a number of these kinds of events, and some nights when I'm tired I say, "Gosh, I can't believe we've got to do one of these." I wanted to come tonight, and this is one that Hillary is

jealous of me that I got to do that she didn't, because of our admiration for Barbara.

I want to read you something. I normally don't speak from notes at these things, but I just want to read you this. Barbara Mikulski: the first Democratic woman to hold a Senate seat in her own right; the first Democratic woman to serve in both Houses; the first woman to win a statewide election in Maryland; the first woman to have a leadership position in the Senate for our party. She's the first woman Senator to write two mysteries, which I love because I read scads of them every year. *[Laughter]*

What I want to say to you is that she got to be all that—first, first, first, first—not because she was a woman but because she has the heart of a lion and because she's done good things for the people of Maryland.

The State of Maryland has been extraordinarily good to me, and we've won two great victories there—because I didn't have to run against Barbara Mikulski. *[Laughter]* And there's so many things that I could say about her, but let me just say a couple of things.

First of all, in 1993, when we were being absolutely eviscerated with criticism from the Republicans in Congress, and when, to the person, they voted against my economic plan, and they said it would cause a terrible recession, and they said it was going to raise taxes on ordinary people—they said all these things—we carried that by one vote in the Senate. And if Barbara Mikulski hadn't voted that way, we wouldn't have the economy we enjoy today. But more importantly, Barbara Mikulski gave other people the courage to vote right. When it comes to a tough fight, she is the tallest member of the United States Senate.

And I'm grateful to her for standing with me in the fight for safer streets, for 100,000 police, and to get the assault weapons off the streets. I'm grateful to her for helping to create the national service program, AmeriCorps, which has now given 100,000 young people, a lot of them in Maryland, a chance to earn money to go to college while serving in their communities. I'm grateful to her for leading the fight for safer food. The Food Safety Act that we adopted is profoundly important, and it will become more important in the years ahead as we have more

and more food exported from the United States to other countries, more and more food imported into our country from others. I'm grateful to her for the work she's done on women's health in so many different areas. I'm grateful to her because she believes that we're here to do things. And I will say again, this is a year which is election year, and the country is in great shape, and I'm grateful for that. But Barbara Mikulski is helping me to challenge the Republican majority in Congress not to sit still and relax and enjoy the success of America but to take it as an opportunity and an obligation to deal with the long-term challenges of this country, to deal with the challenge of fixing Social Security; to deal with the challenge of making sure that we don't keep killing another 1,000 kids a day by not doing what we can to reduce teenage smoking, to deal with the further challenges of child care and education and the environment. We have a lot to do, and we need some more doers in the Congress. I don't think a single soul here doubts that there is no bigger doer in the Congress than Barbara Mikulski.

Let me say, one of the big votes that Congress is going to face in the next few days—the Senate when they come back—is whether to vote to enlarge NATO, to take in Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland. I wish every constituent of Senator Mikulski could have been with me in Warsaw when we had tens of thousands of people in the square there, and I introduced Barbara Mikulski, a daughter of Poland, to the assembled crowd, along with the then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Shalikashvili, also a Polish American.

What we want to do in expanding NATO is to give Poles the chance and the security in their own country to grow up and live their dreams, to have the kinds of careers and lives that Barbara Mikulski has had.

The last thing I want to say, which is, to me, more important than anything else: She is a person who lives her faith. She believes that we will all be judged by whether we have tried to provide opportunity to those without it, whether we have tried to take decent care of those who through no fault of their own are in genuine need. And she has helped us to prove that the Democratic philosophy that

we have advanced, beyond any shadow of a doubt, demonstrates that the whole country does better when more people have opportunity.

For all those reasons, I predict an overwhelming victory in November. And I thank you for making sure it happens.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:50 p.m. at the Hay Adams Hotel.

### **Remarks on the Northern Ireland Peace Process and an Exchange With Reporters**

*April 10, 1998*

**The President.** Good afternoon. After a 30-year winter of sectarian violence, Northern Ireland today has the promise of a springtime of peace. The agreement that has emerged from the Northern Ireland peace talks opens the way for the people there to build a society based on enduring peace, justice, and equality. The vision and commitment of the participants in the talks has made real the prayers for peace on both sides of the Atlantic and both sides of the peace line.

All friends of Ireland and Northern Ireland know the task of making the peace endure will be difficult. The path of peace is never easy. But the parties have made brave decisions. They have chosen hope over hate, the promise of the future over the poison of the past. And in so doing, already they have written a new chapter in the rich history of their island, a chapter of resolute courage that inspires us all.

In the days to come, there may be those who will try to undermine this great achievement, not only with words but perhaps also with violence. All the parties and all the rest of us must stand shoulder to shoulder to defy any such appeals.

On this Good Friday, we give thanks for the work of Prime Minister Ahern and Prime Minister Blair, two truly remarkable leaders who did an unbelievable job in these talks. We give thanks for the work of Senator George Mitchell, who was brilliant and unbelievably patient and long suffering. We give thanks especially to the leaders of the parties, for they had to make the courageous deci-

sions. We also thank Prime Minister Blair and Prime Minister Ahern's predecessors for starting and nurturing the process of peace.

Together, all these people have created the best chance for peace in a generation. In May, the people of Ireland and Northern Ireland will have the chance to seize the gift they have been given. At this Easter season, British and Irish leaders have followed the admonition of Luke, "to give light to them who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death and to guide their feet into the way of peace." For that, peace-loving people the world over can be very grateful.

### **U.S. Role in the Peace Process**

**Q.** Mr. President, what promises or assurances did the United States make to help move this process along?

**The President.** Well, from the very beginning all I have tried to do is to help create the conditions in which peace could develop and then to do whatever I was asked to do or whatever seemed helpful to encourage and support the parties in the search for peace. And that's all I did last night.

**Q.** Did you offer any assistance in terms of financial aid, and what did you think—

**The President.** No.

**Q.** —where did you really weigh in in all those phone calls.

**The President.** Well, first of all, the answer to your first question is no. Now, we have, as all of you know, an international fund for Ireland, which I have strongly supported. And I do believe that there will be very significant economic benefits flowing to the people of Ireland, both Protestant and Catholic, in Northern Ireland and in the Republic, if this peace takes hold. But there was no specific financial assurance sought, nor was any given.

In terms of the give and take, you know, I made a lot of phone calls last night and up until this morning, actually until right before the last session. But I think the specifics are not all that important. I did what I was asked to do. Again, I was largely guided by the work of Prime Minister Blair and Prime Minister Ahern. I had a very—a long talk, in the middle of the night for me, last night with Senator Mitchell about his work there, and I'm looking forward to seeing him early

next week. I just did what I thought would help. And I tried to do what I was asked to do.

**Q.** Mr. President, will you be going to Belfast now that they've reached a deal?

**The President.** Well, I really haven't had much discussion about it. No decision has been made. This is not even a day to think about that. This is a day to celebrate the achievement of the people and the peace talks.

#### ***Visa for Sinn Fein Leader Gerry Adams***

**Q.** President Clinton, do you feel somewhat vindicated for the policies that—including giving Gerry Adams a visa here—that have come under scrutiny and at times have brought you some derision from other parts of the world for being too provocative.

**The President.** Well, when I did it, I thought it would help to create a climate in which peace might emerge. And I believe it was a positive thing to do. I believed it then, I believe it now.

But make no mistake about it. Whenever peace is made by people anywhere, the credit belongs to the parties whose own lives and livelihoods and children and future are on the line. And that's the way I feel today. If anything that I or the United States was able to do was helpful, especially because of our historic ties to Great Britain and because of the enormous number of Irish-Americans we have and the feelings we have for the Irish and their troubles, then I am very grateful. But the credit for this belongs to the people who made the decisions.

**Q.** What role do you expect to play from now on?

#### ***Stability of the Accord***

**Q.** Mr. President, how fragile is the peace agreement? How fragile is it, and will it be able to withstand a violation of the cease-fire?

**The President.** Well, I think the parties will honor it. They fought too hard over the details—down to the 11th hour and then some. They even went past Senator Mitchell's deadline and well into this Good Friday. Given Irish history, maybe it's appropriate that this was done on this day.

So they fought too hard over the details to violate them. I expect the parties to honor the agreement. And then it's really up to the people. The people of Northern Ireland and the people of the Republic of Ireland are going to have a vote on it in May, in late May, and their judgment will prevail.

Will there be those who are disgruntled, who may seek to violate the cease-fire, who are not part of the parties that have signed off on this agreement? There may well be. But if we all stand shoulder-to-shoulder together and everyone understands that the integrity of the leaders and the parties that are part of this process is still unshakable and rock solid, I think we'll be all right. We just need to let the Irish people have their say, and I think they will have their say.

#### ***U.S. Role in the Peace Process***

**Q.** What role do you expect to play from now on in this process, in terms of trying to maintain this agreement?

**The President.** Well, I don't know. If I can be helpful, I will. That's been my position all along. That's what I tell everybody that talks to me about it. But no decision has been made about that, and you know, the United States believes in this process passionately. I, personally, am deeply committed to it. And if the leaders think there's something I can do to be helpful, well, of course, I'll try. But there's been no discussion about it and no decision made.

**Q.** Mr. President, could there have been an agreement today without your efforts last night?

**The President.** Oh, I certainly—I wouldn't say there couldn't have been. I was asked to help; I did my best to help.

But let me say again, there were people that I was talking to up until 8, 9 o'clock even later this morning who haven't been to bed in 48 hours. They sat and talked and worked and fought and argued and got back together. And for some of them, they put their political lives on the line; others may have put even more on the line, as you well know.

And they and the Prime Ministers and Senator Mitchell, who somehow kept it all together, they deserve the credit. I just tried to do what I was asked to do. If I played



a positive role, I'm grateful to have had the chance to do so.

### **President's Easter Plans**

**Q.** Happy Easter. Are you going to Camp David?

**The President.** I am. We're going up probably in the early evening, and I hope all of you have a great holiday. Bless you.

### **Middle East Peace Process**

**Q.** What are you going to do about the Middle East? [Laughter]

**The President.** Well, we got Bosnia and Haiti, and now, I hope, Ireland. And I'll just keep working on it. The Irish thing ought to give you hope for the Middle East because the lesson is: just don't ever stop. And in the end, if the will for peace is stronger than the impulse to avoid it and the impulse to avoid the tough decisions and the sacrifices that are made—that have to be made—then the will for peace can prevail. That's the lesson here.

So I would hope that those who care desperately about the Middle East and want the peace process there to prevail will take great heart here, because believe you me, I know a lot about this. There were a lot of tough decisions which had to be made, nobody could get everything they wanted, and risks had to be taken. And they were taken. And they now will be taken. And it seems to me that the friends of peace in the Middle East should take great heart from this, and perhaps we'll even find some examples that could be followed.

Thank you.

### **Reaction to Agreement**

**Q.** Mrs. Clinton said that peace in Ireland is an article of faith. Is there going to be any kind of Clinton celebration here this evening?

**The President.** I'm celebrating right now, but we need to let the Irish people have their say. That's going to be in a few weeks.

**Q.** Going to let these guys go to sleep?

**The President.** Right now I want these guys to go to sleep. I hope nothing serious happens to our country in the next 8 hours, because I've got a bunch of pickle brains in the NSC. [Laughter]

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:30 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Bertie Ahern and former Prime Minister John Bruton of Ireland; Prime Minister Tony Blair and former Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom; George J. Mitchell, Special Assistant to the President for Northern Ireland; and Sinn Féin leader Gerry Adams.

### **Message on the 30th Anniversary of the Fair Housing Act**

*April 10, 1998*

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating the 30th anniversary of the enactment of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968—the Federal Fair Housing Act.

Within a week of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the Congress passed and President Johnson signed into law this landmark legislation, which has helped countless Americans achieve the American Dream. The theme of this anniversary celebration, “Many Neighborhoods—One America,” reflects the reality that people of diverse cultures and backgrounds can live together in harmony and reaffirm the American ideals of equality, opportunity, and freedom.

By limiting housing choice, discrimination reduces the quality of life for many Americans. During the past three decades, we have made great strides in opening housing markets. But housing discrimination, although less apparent than in years past, still exists, and the need to enforce fair housing laws vigorously remains as urgent today as ever.

My Administration is committed to building strong partnerships between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and local communities. I have proposed the largest single increase in HUD's civil rights enforcement programs in two decades. My proposal includes a significant increase in funding for HUD's Fair Housing Initiatives and Fair Housing Assistance Programs that, among other things, will combat racially motivated hate crimes related to housing. We are also seeking congressional approval to raise the Federal Housing Administration loan limit so that more Americans, including minorities and women, can become homeowners.

Working together, we can create a more just society that underscores our shared strengths instead of focusing on our differences. The Fair Housing Act continues to be an indispensable tool in these efforts, and as we celebrate its 30th anniversary, I call on all Americans to join me in making division and discrimination issues of the past, and to make America a stronger, better place to live for all of our people.

Best wishes for a memorable anniversary celebration.

**Bill Clinton**

**Proclamation 7081—Pan American Day and Pan American Week, 1998**

*April 10, 1998*

*By the President of the United States of America*

**A Proclamation**

Today, the nations of the Americas stand at the forefront of a promising new era of exciting growth and global cooperation. Americans north and south of the equator are communicating, interacting, and trading with one another more than ever before. All the nations in our hemisphere but one enjoy freely elected governments that promote human rights, free enterprise, and sustainable economic development through free trade. These vibrant democracies continue to seek opportunities to work together for the security, prosperity, and general welfare of all our citizens.

In keeping with this spirit of cooperation, the leaders of the 34 American democracies will meet in Santiago, Chile, on April 18 and 19 for the second Summit of the Americas. The United States hosted the first such summit in Miami in December 1994, and we look forward to strengthening our involvement in what is becoming a mature partnership that is fostering increased prosperity and security for our country. We hope to reach agreements in Santiago that will enhance hemispheric collaboration in more than 20 areas—including education, economic integration, democracy, justice, counternarcotics, security, poverty, and human rights.

This month also marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Organization of American States (OAS), a cornerstone of cooperation in our hemisphere. The most recent successes of the OAS include agreements against corruption and illegal firearms trafficking and ratification of the Washington Protocol, which provides for the suspension from the OAS of any country whose democracy has been overthrown by force. We applaud the crucial role the OAS plays in promoting and preserving democracy and human rights in the Americas. We look forward to its continued success in multilateral efforts to deepen the roots of democracy in this hemisphere and create new possibilities for progress in the next millennium.

The peoples of the Americas stand united in a commitment to democratic values and to increased regional cooperation and understanding. The partnership among our countries is laying the foundations for lasting freedom, prosperity, and peace in our hemisphere and bringing to reality our shared vision of a brighter future.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton**, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, April 14, 1998, as Pan American Day and April 12 through April 18, 1998, as Pan American Week. I urge the Governors of the 50 States, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the officials of other areas under the flag of the United States of America to honor these observances with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

**In Witness Whereof**, I have hereunto set my hand this tenth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-second.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., April 14, 1998]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on April 15.

---

### **Digest of Other White House Announcements**

---

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

---

#### **April 5**

The President had a telephone conversation with Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom concerning the Northern Ireland peace process.

#### **April 6**

In the morning, the President had a telephone conversation with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia concerning the President's recent visit to Africa and the upcoming meeting of the heads of state of the world's leading industrialized democracies in Birmingham, United Kingdom.

In the afternoon, the President met with student-athletes and their sponsors in the Oval Office.

The President announced the nomination of Diane D. Blair to serve as a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The President appointed Tony Coelho, Everett M. Ehrlich, Gilbert F. Casellas, and Lorraine Green as members of the U.S. Census Monitoring Board.

#### **April 7**

In the morning, the President traveled to Kansas City, MO. While en route aboard Air Force One, he had a telephone conversation with Prime Minister Bertie Ahern of Ireland to express his sympathies for the death of Mr. Ahern's mother.

In the afternoon, the President toured the Kansas City Jazz Museum and the Negro Baseball League Museum. In the evening, he traveled to Chicago, IL.

#### **April 8**

In the afternoon, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to nominate Dayton R. Duncan as Chair and Gerald E. Galloway, Jr., William L. Graf, Anthony P. Grassi, Debbie Jaramillo, Charles

R. Jordan, Daniel Kemmis, David Olsen, Yolanda Rivera, Donald G. Sampson, Maria F. Teran, and P. Kay Whitlock as members of the American Heritage Rivers Initiative Advisory Committee.

The President announced his intention to nominate Vivian Lowery Derryck and Susan E. Rice as members of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation.

#### **April 9**

In the morning, the President traveled to Carrollton, KY, and in the afternoon, he returned to Washington, DC.

In the evening, the President attended a dinner honoring Senator Mary L. Landrieu at a private residence.

The President declared a major disaster in Alabama and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms and tornadoes beginning on April 8 and continuing.

The President announced that he has amended the major disaster declaration for Georgia, declared March 11, to include seven additional counties hard hit by the severe storms and tornadoes.

In the late evening, the President had a telephone conversation with Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom to discuss the Northern Ireland peace process.

#### **April 10**

After midnight, the President had further telephone conversations on the Northern Ireland peace process with Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom; Gerry Adams, leader, Sinn Féin; John Hume, leader, Social Democratic and Labor Party; Samuel R. Berger, National Security Adviser; James B. Steinberg, Deputy National Security Adviser; former Senator George J. Mitchell, independent chairman of the multiparty talks in Northern Ireland; Gerry Adams, again; David Trimble, leader, Northern Ireland Ulster Unionist Party; Prime Minister Blair, twice again; Prime Minister Bertie Ahern of Ireland; and Mr. Hume again.

In the afternoon, the President hosted a working lunch for President Fidel Ramos of the Philippines in the Map Room.

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton went to Camp David, MD, for the Easter holiday weekend.

---

**Nominations  
Submitted to the Senate**

---

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

---

**Checklist of  
White House Press Releases**

---

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

***Released April 3<sup>1</sup>***

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District judge for the Central District of Illinois

---

<sup>1</sup> This release was not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.

***Released April 6***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

***Released April 9***

Transcript of a press briefing by Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Planning Bruce Reed, and Press Secretary Mike McCurry on tobacco legislation

Statement by the Press Secretary: Tragic Accident During Hajj Pilgrimage

***Released April 10***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by the Press Secretary: Presidential Delegation to Key European Capitals To Consult on the Situation in Kosovo

---

**Acts Approved  
by the President**

---

***Approved April 6***

S. 758 / Public Law 105-166  
Lobbying Disclosure Technical Amendments Act of 1998